

SAINT GEORGE

No. 47. Vol. XII.

July, 1909.

THE REFORM OF OXFORD¹

By HENRY CLAY

THE Chancellor of a University is not as a rule one of its active officials ; Lord Curzon, the Chancellor of the University of Oxford, has chosen to break this rule. He was elected to his office at a time when the agitation for reform, both within the University and without, was beginning to show promise of effectiveness. He determined to use his position as at once the chief representative of the University to the outer world and its "first servant" to facilitate the changes which he came to the conclusion were necessary. He believes that these changes can be made by the University itself, that a Royal Commission is both unnecessary and undesirable ; and in that belief he has compiled his Memorandum for the consideration of the Hebdomadal Council and the University's legislature generally. His aim is to state methodically the chief criticisms passed on Oxford of to-day in their relation to each other and to the permanent

¹ *Principles and Methods of University Reform*, by Lord Curzon of Kedleston, Chancellor of Oxford University. Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d. net.

SAINT GEORGE

principles underlying the University's development. In the execution of this aim he makes a fairly complete survey of the existing machinery and work of the University; and, while indicating his own views as to the shape which reform should take, he endeavours to make his Memorandum equally useful to all, whether they agree with him or not, as a succinct and complete statement of the problem and its conditions.

As such a statement the value of the Memorandum can hardly be overestimated. There is no need to summarize it here; no one who will not take the trouble to read so comprehensive, lucid, and brief a document has a right to an opinion on its subject. Few Oxford men, even among those who wish for reform, and still fewer of her outside critics, have any clear idea of the working constitution of the University, or of the history which explains its obvious anomalies. Lord Curzon's Memorandum makes available and accessible such knowledge, and makes possible that intelligent discussion which is necessary to secure smooth and economical reform. On other subjects the Memorandum is equally illuminating. The complicated finance of the University, the machinery of administration, the confused relations of Colleges and University and the division of powers between them, all needed explaining in some such form as this Memorandum, if the average member of Convocation is to be induced to take any intelligent interest in the reform of the institution which he, in the last resort, governs. The value of the Memorandum as a contribution to reform is twofold. In the first place, it will remove ungrounded apprehensions that the Oxford which its children love is to be sacrificed to the modern craving for change. At present the reformer in Oxford has to contend not merely with the difficulties of the problem itself, but with the vast body of hostility which from unthinking loyalty to the institution opposes any and every suggestion of change. Lord Curzon will remove much of this opposition. His survey of

THE REFORM OF OXFORD

the University shows that there is much at present cumbering its work, which not even the most stubborn conservative can regard as essential to the University's life. It shows, moreover, that much of the criticism directed against Oxford is just, and that the grounds for it can easily be removed without imperilling anything that is dear from association. Many of the points raised in the Memorandum are, of course, debatable; but a sufficient number are beyond debate to convince everyone of the necessity of some change—and once that is admitted the task of reform is enormously facilitated. In the second place, the Memorandum, with its clear account of existing conditions, will give definiteness to desires for reform at present vague. It will give concreteness to criticisms at present ineffective because of their indefiniteness. It will crystallize round a limited number of definite problems the multitude of efforts and aspirations which are at present wasted through lack of direction. Reform has long been in the air, and the discussion of it has too often been in the same region. With a definite basis provided in this Memorandum, discussion may now be expected to lead to something.

Certain definite suggestions do emerge in this way from the systematic survey of the University's work and machinery. Some change in the constitution of the University is obviously a first necessity—not because it is in itself of the first importance, but because it is the condition of most other changes. Under the existing constitution ultimate authority is vested in Convocation, the whole body of Masters of Arts who have retained their membership of the University. This authority practically resolves itself into a power of veto, which is exercised only often enough to discredit the body that exercises it. For unfortunately Convocation, though in intention the most representative assembly in the University, is far from being representative of many of the best elements of the University. The M.A. degree, which is the essential qualification for mem-

SAINT GEORGE

bership, has no longer any educational significance, merely representing the expenditure of so much money in University and College charges ; and the majority of those who proceed to it do so only because the custom of two professions, those of teaching and preaching, requires them to do so. The resulting situation is not unlike the contemporary situation in politics ; in the University as in the country's constitution the ultimate power of veto is possessed by a body which by its very nature inclines to support a conservative as opposed to a progressive policy. Lord Curzon suggests that this veto should be limited, the constitution of Convocation being left practically unchanged. Others, with less tenderness for clerical dignity, will probably advocate that an educational significance, instead of a merely pecuniary significance, be given to the distinction between Bachelor and Master of Arts. But whatever change is adopted, Lord Curzon makes obvious the necessity for some change. Similarly Congregation, which should be the assembly of resident teachers, has lost its essential character ; and again the Memorandum compels attention to the necessity of restoring that character. And the Hebdomadal Council, which should roughly correspond in the University to the Cabinet in the national polity, is not necessarily representative of the University ; and, whether representative or not, is not in a position to exert a unifying influence or carry out a consistent policy in the administration of the University.

There is indeed very little unity and policy of any sort in the University's administration. One reason for this, clearly revealed by the Memorandum, lies in the separation of financial responsibility from executive control. Not only has the University to pursue its work in the presence of twenty independent financial authorities in the colleges ; but in its own constitution the chief executive authority, the Council, is not a financial authority at all ; and the control and responsibility of finance is divided between two distinct bodies. Pro-

THE REFORM OF OXFORD

bably Lord Curzon's most important constructive suggestion is that there should be a financial Board of Control, bringing into close relation with itself and with each other the Hebdomadal Council, the University Chest and the Delegates of the Common University Fund. Such a board would not only give unity to the administration of the University itself, but could also do much to correlate the expenditure of the colleges, and ensure economy in the expenditure by these independent authorities of funds which after all are held in trust for the objects of the whole University.

In other respects than that of finance the Memorandum suggests the need of more centralized administration. The Boards of Faculties and Boards of Studies established by the Act of 1882 no longer provide an adequate machinery for directing and controlling the University's teaching. With the development of new studies they have lost their representative character ; and though they might be made representative of existing studies again, there exists no provision for their automatic adjustment to changing conditions in the future. The Royal Commissions, whose statutes are responsible for the present condition of Oxford government, both made it their chief aim to strengthen the University as against the Colleges. To a certain extent they succeeded. The existence of the Professoriat and University teaching staff and the possibility of a unity as real in the case of the University as in that of the colleges are due to them. But their method was unfortunate. It seems to have been to constitute a separate and almost independent authority for each separate function they intended the University to perform ; and to leave to these authorities themselves the task of determining their interrelation and subordination. Convocation obviously cannot exercise initiative ; Congregation in its present form is too unwieldy to deal with much beyond matters of principle ; and Council is too tied and too limited, especially on the financial side, in its

SAINT GEORGE

powers to exercise any effective co-ordination of this complicated machine. The difficulty of the situation is accentuated by the absence of any organized and continuous Secretariat.

As a basis then for the discussion of reform, as a justification for certain changes immediately necessary in the machinery of administration, the Memorandum is admirable. One has only one criticism to make—that its value would have been greatly increased by reducing its price. But it has the defects of its virtues, and they are not small. Lord Curzon has been praised for the "Liberal" tone of his Memorandum; as a matter of fact it would be difficult to find a better example of the Conservative attitude to reform. The reform of an institution can be approached from two standpoints. It can be approached from the standpoint of an ideal to which the institution is to be made to conform; or it can be approached by an examination of the institution as it is. Lord Curzon has chosen the latter method. He has a bureaucrat's dread of legislative alteration. On the whole he is satisfied with Oxford. He does not want to change the University, but merely to make it more efficient—more effectively what it is at present. He never suspects that there may be something radically wrong, something wrong in principle. Perhaps there is not; but in a document that professes to set forth "the principles and methods" of University Reform, the question should have been asked and some test applied. Lord Curzon's method is to examine the parts of the problem, to overhaul the machinery of the University, laying bare a defect here, a device to be preserved there, suggesting an improvement here, a change there. And valuable as this method is in preparing the way for more important considerations, it is, so far as these more important considerations are concerned, a begging of the question. Practically the Memorandum assumes that in its main lines the constitution of Oxford is what it should be; though certain changes may be necessary to enable it to work more

THE REFORM OF OXFORD

smoothly and effectively. It is only in the last chapter that we read that “in discussing the circumstances of Oxford *it has been impossible not to frame some conception* of the functions which a University . . . should perform.” “Impossible not to frame some conception!” Surely such a conception is the very essential and starting-point of any consideration of reform at all! The Memorandum, it may be said, does not profess to be a programme of reform; but considering it merely as a basis for discussion, we expect some mention of the wider issues of reform. What is the University for? Whom is it for? are questions which Lord Curzon is forced into asking himself; but he answers them reluctantly, and will not make them the basis of his consideration of reform. His ideal of a University can be inferred from the Memorandum; but he will not state it explicitly. He prefers to stick to the solid ground of existing institutions and existing methods; and to confine his efforts to developing the same institutions and the same methods a little way along the same lines. There is all the bureaucrat's suspicion of idealism; and in the matter of University reform surely the ideal is everything. The University is not a machine, to be shaped and altered by statutes. It is a person; and will always approximate to the ideal which is held most clearly and persistently by its members. Lord Curzon's conception of reform is a little mechanical. If he wished to influence the University's ultimate development, he would have aimed at shaping the ideals of its most devoted children. For in the University even more than in the State the idealist is the only really practical politician.

Let us turn, then, to these fundamental questions, What is Oxford for? and Whom is it for? Let us ask what conception we are to form of the functions of a University, “so historical in its character and so majestic in its influence”? What is the answer Lord Curzon gives, when at last he is forced into asking the question? “A fourfold duty lies upon it; to provide the

SAINT GEORGE

best teaching over the entire field of knowledge of which its own resources and the progress of science may admit ; to offer this teaching to the widest range of students ; to mould and shape them not merely by the training of the intellect, but by the discipline of spirit, so that, wherever they go, they may be worthy citizens or worthy servants of the State ; and to extend by original inquiry the frontiers of learning." It is a sufficiently noble conception of the University's duties. The first and fourth are really one duty. It is of the essence of the idea of a University that the highest instruction can only be given by men who are themselves advancing the frontiers of knowledge. Indeed, the feeling is growing that the true definition of University instruction in a subject includes instruction in the methods by which our knowledge of the subject is extended ; but Lord Curzon would hardly accept a definition of University teaching which put outside its scope all the Pass Men and a considerable proportion of the Honours Men at present in Oxford. And the third duty, the duty of training character, is implied in the first ; since the University can hardly take any but the widest view of education.

Thus we find that the University exists to provide the highest form of education for the widest possible range of students. Examine the Memorandum in the light of this conception. At once the title of one chapter, hitherto reasonable enough, acquires an entirely new significance. "The Admission of Poor Men!" Then does the University discriminate against poor men? Can it in the light of a true conception of its functions take cognizance of poverty or class in the applicants for its benefits? It should be an institution for the giving of education and nothing more. Its members should be those people out of all the nation who are most competent to give or capable of benefiting by such education. Does the University of Oxford, as we know it to-day, succeed by these tests? Of course it does not.

THE REFORM OF OXFORD

Oxford is subjected to a great deal of unfair criticism for the alleged abuse of her endowments. Lord Curzon points out that at least 85 per cent of the endowments provided for scholarships and exhibitions are enjoyed by men who could not come to Oxford without them ; and the test by which these men are selected is an educational test. Probably it is not the best test, and operates unfairly against some poor men who are suitable for a University education. But it is, at any rate, an educational test ; and the frequent Seconds, Thirds, and Fourths secured in the schools by men who have climbed the educational ladder from elementary school to University suggests that Oxford is not alone in sometimes selecting the wrong man for educational benefits. Moreover, from the tone of some criticism one would think that the whole body of Oxford undergraduates were living on endowments intended for the poor ; whereas in fact some five-sixths of the number pay for their education rather more than it costs the University to give it them. But in spite of the unfairness of much of this criticism, it is sound in principle. The present system of conducting Oxford does automatically discriminate against the poor man. Those five-sixths of the whole number of students are not admitted as being the fittest who can be found for the University's benefits. They have passed no adequate intellectual test. Responsions and its corresponding examinations represent the intellectual attainments of the average boy of sixteen—no more ; and the work of the Pass Man in Oxford is not up to the standard of a sixth form in a good school. Hence the only principle of selection in the case of five-sixths of the University's members, a dominant majority, is the ability to spend five or six hundred pounds on three years' education—emphatically not an educational test.

Thus Oxford becomes in practice an institution for the higher education of rich men. Lord Curzon has a suspicion of this, though his method of approaching the problem of

SAINT GEORGE

reform does not permit him to perceive it clearly. He therefore advocates the opening of the University to the poor man a little further. He discusses expenses carefully, and makes suggestions for their reduction. Finally, since all the other undergraduates live in colleges, and the existing colleges are too expensive for poor men, he suggests a Poor Man's College. Presumably its official title would not be "The Poor Man's College"; but it is hard to see how it would avoid the danger which he sees in the case of hostels for poorer men, "that a distinct line of social cleavage might be created between the well-to-do man and the poor man . . . and that in endeavouring to subsidize poverty we might in reality penalize it." But this suggested opening of the University's door to the poor does not leave him comfortable; he still has a suspicion that his "conception of the function which a University, so historical in its character and so majestic in its influence should perform," is not adequately met; and he enters into an eloquent defence of the Pass Man and the rich man. "It is as desirable," he says, "that Oxford should educate the future country squire, or nobleman, or banker, or member of Parliament, or even the Guardsman, as it is that it should sharpen the wits of the schoolmaster or the cultivated artisan." By all means! Oxford should not ask from what class any of the applicants for its benefits comes, provided he is intellectually worthy of those benefits. But at present the Guardsman who does not want to work can come, and the cultivated artisan who does want to work cannot come. And—the crux of the whole matter—the artisan cannot come because the Guardsman can come, because Oxford is the possession of the rich man, because it is still a playground as much as a home of learning, because it is still a continuation of that essentially "class" institution, the Public School. The poor man cannot come, because the standard of expenditure is set by the majority of the students, and the majority are neither

THE REFORM OF OXFORD

poor men nor sincere students. For the same reason the magnificent endowments of the colleges avail to support only one-sixth of the total number of undergraduates ; while there are boys anxious to enter the University whose parents' whole incomes are less than a college scholarship. There is no particular virtue in being a poor man, but neither is there in being a rich man ; and the University exists to educate the best brains in the nation, to encourage all to aspire to her benefits and select the most worthy. Lord Curzon apparently regards the University as existing for the education of *all* the rich, a careful selection of the lower middle class, and an occasional artisan.

What is the root of the difficulty ? Lord Curzon reveals it, though he will not accept the results of his analysis. It is the college system that makes Oxford the rich man's University ; and the attempt to alter that condition by founding a Poor Man's College would probably fail altogether, while if successful it would confirm rather than alter the present unsatisfactory conditions. Colleges are inevitably expensive institutions. The tradition of domestic service, and the methods of that service, are not economical. The buildings are conspicuously lacking in modern appliances of economic house-keeping ; and they are moreover expensive to keep in repair. The standard of entertaining is set by the man who can afford £200 a year on his education without difficulty, and would ruin any poor man not heavily subsidized. Not only the standard of entertaining, but the whole standard of life is set by the comparatively rich man ; and in a close community like a college the standard of the majority enforces itself effectively. The college clubs are a luxury which most continental university students contrive to dispense with ; but it would be difficult for any Oxford undergraduate to refuse his subscription to them. And the college system has other disadvantages. The poor man is excluded not only by the expense of the life, but by social considerations.

SAINT GEORGE

There is no suggestion of snobbishness. It is simply that the differences of thought, habit, and etiquette between a public schoolboy and a Council Schoolboy are so great that the two will not, when other friends are available, associate freely. In some colleges the difficulty is less than in others. In Balliol an artisan might make himself at home ; in Magdalen he would feel about as much at home as he would in the officers' mess of a Guards Regiment. And Oxford college life is of so intimate a character that it must always be extremely difficult to become a part of it for anyone whose previous training is widely different from that of the majority.

Thus the college system automatically restricts the numbers of the poor man, if it does not exclude him altogether. It exercises a similar automatic selection against the older man. At present the colleges are homogeneous communities. In spite of the valuable elements supplied by the graduates of Scotch and other Universities, and by boys from the smaller schools, the colleges of Oxford take their customs and ideals from the Public School man. Within that not very elastic category there are of course variations ; but on the whole the success of the colleges in providing an enjoyable life and producing a recognizable type lies in their intimate connection with the public schools. The University does something to modify the result of a public school education ; it does not let its members leave it quite so case-hardened against anything in the nature of new ideas as it finds them. But it remains true that the average Oxford freshman's one ambition is to be as like his fellows as possible, and his inevitable tendency to regard with suspicion anyone who lacks the very obvious characteristics of the public school type. Hence the older man, or the man who is in any other way exceptional, finds it difficult to feel himself really a member of the community he has entered ; and unless he can do that he loses the whole benefit of college life.

Hence, the system tends to exclude elements of increasing

THE REFORM OF OXFORD

value to the University. The married man whose enthusiasm for learning brings him to Oxford, in spite of the sacrifices often involved ; the research student whose undergraduate work is finished ; the artisan who will presently be coming up from tutorial classes in industrial centres will all be out of place in communities whose dominant members came up "to have a good time," or "to get their Blue." And these are the elements which the University needs to encourage. Its atmosphere requires the widest possible variety of elements, if it is to possess that bracing quality in which original work is done, and individuality of character brought out. Especially does the college system interfere with the free exchange of men, which is so valuable an element in German University life. At present Oxford may regard herself as superior to the modern Universities in the great industrial centres. But presently they will climb to her level. Already the advanced student of chemistry goes to Manchester rather than Oxford, of archæology to Liverpool, of economics to any place rather than Oxford ; and unless Oxford can settle her relations with her new colleagues and rivals on some permanent basis of mutual assistance, she will lose her hold on the nation, and become essentially, as well as accidentally, the University of a limited wealthy class.

The college system then is at the root of most of Oxford's difficulties ; but no Oxford man could be found to advocate the destruction of the colleges ; nor of course is it necessary. All that is necessary—and it is urgently necessary—is to destroy the colleges' monopoly of the University. This is the issue Lord Curzon refuses to raise. "A University of Colleges Oxford is, and a University of Colleges it must remain." This is the position he maintains in the face of all difficulties. The colleges decide who shall enter the University and what they shall do ; they control the teaching and determine the mode of life. The University conducts examinations and performs a few other offices which the colleges

SAINT GEORGE

cannot do for themselves ; and exists apparently only to co-ordinate the activities of the colleges. Thus it is necessary either to reform the colleges individually or break down their monopoly. The former would be a much more difficult task than the latter. Any attempt to alter their character by external statute would meet with at least twenty times the opposition to a similar alteration of the University. The loyalty of the Oxford man, with its unfortunate conservatism, is much more a feeling for his college than for his University. Moreover, the task of reform, apart from opposition, would be immensely more difficult and hazardous. A sudden change might destroy instead of altering them ; and no one wishes their long life to come to a sudden end, however admirable the institution that succeeds them. But indirect reform should not be difficult. Any effective reform of the University will react on them. If their monopoly is once broken down they will be forced to reform themselves.

Against any attempt to create a new class of University student the existing Non-Collegiate system will be used as an argument ; but it is irrelevant. The Non-Collegiate system, or—as Lord Curzon, probably unconscious of the significance of the suggestion, would call it—the University, system has never been given a fair trial. It has not attracted the best men. It has had practically no endowment, and has been starved for want of it. The non-collegiate students have always been in a hopeless minority with relation to the college students ; and the fundamental mistake has been made of attempting to organize them as another, cheap, inferior college.

The college system may be the peculiar glory of Oxford and Cambridge ; but that is no reason for ignoring the experience of every other University in the world. A University system—a system in which the University leaves the details of house-keeping to the students, and concerns itself solely with their education—has all the advantages which the college

THE REFORM OF OXFORD

system lacks. It makes no distinction of wealth or class, intentional or unintentional. It adapts itself to all ages, to single, married, man, and woman, with equal ease. It makes room for the artisan and the artist, for the research student from a provincial university, and the boy from a provincial grammar school. It does not lend itself to the cult of competitive athletics ; and it does not make the rich man's riches an obstacle to the admission of the poor man. There is only one important objection to it ; and that, I think, can be shown to be invalid. The objection is that an Oxford education has hitherto produced, not merely an Oxford graduate, but an Oxford "man" ; that Oxford's degree is the mark not merely of a certain efficiency of intellect, but of a type of character, of an all-round culture. If the University as opposed to the college system cannot perform this, it is condemned. This objection indicates a danger that undoubtedly has to be avoided, but it can be avoided. "An Oxford man" is a question-begging term. If it implies a certain excessive interest in schoolboy's games, it can be replied that "Eights" are a comparatively recent invention. Inter-university contests are even more modern. And surely John Keble and Mark Pattison have a greater right to be considered typical "Oxford men" than Mr. C. B. Fry. Then again social intercourse, the play of mind upon mind, is possible without the college system ; and the exchange of ideas between men of different ranks and classes, which Lord Curzon claims as one of the chief educational influences of Oxford, will be vastly increased by throwing the University open to other ranks and wider classes. And colleges are not confined to Oxford. A large number of elementary school teachers receive their education in colleges, training colleges, without becoming "Oxford men." Thus one is brought to the conclusion that the characteristics of the best "Oxford man" are due partly to his home training, and could not be retained in any scheme which threw the University

SAINT GEORGE

open to poor men, and partly to the method of tuition peculiar to Oxford.

Now the only method of tuition which is peculiar to Oxford does not require the College System for its effective exercise. The Tutorial System—an expensive system, but, if anything ever was, worth the expense—could be applied equally to the conditions of University students ; and would safeguard the new system against all its alleged dangers. If then one may add a suggestion to the list of reforms which Lord Curzon has presented to Council for consideration, it is that the University should make a beginning of a serious Non-Collegiate system. Let it give the students an honourable name. Let it endow scholarships for them, attract to the system the best men, and having attracted them, let it by the efficiency of its tutors secure for them all the benefits of the University. Let the University enter into friendly competition with the colleges. Let it begin by treating handsomely all those valuable students who by their special circumstances will welcome the elasticity of the new system ; and let it gradually collect under its ægis a body of students with a tradition of direct loyalty to the University, whose work in its volume and excellence will surpass that of any single college.

There is no hostility to the colleges in such a proposal, though its successful adoption would have an enormous influence on their ultimate development. The University would be able to control the admission of undergraduates more effectively than it does at present ; and the existence of a real alternative to the colleges would enable it to offer its hospitality to a much larger proportion of the nation. It could cast its nets wide, and leave the meshes large, so that only the big fish were brought in. “Non cuivis homini contingit adire Corinthum.” There will never be room in Oxford for all the men and women who would like to come there. At present the chief differentia between those who can and those who cannot come is

THE REFORM OF OXFORD

the possession of £500 to spare. With necessary expenses cut down to a third what they are at present, the test of admission will be brains.

The growth of a class of University students outside themselves would compel the colleges to decide what their position in the national educational system was to be. Ultimately in any case, very soon if they have to face the competition of a considerable body of University students, they will have to decide whether they wish to become something analogous to the *Corps* and *Burschenschaften* of Heidelberg and Bonn, or the homes of sound learning and true religion, of plain living and high thinking, which their founders intended them to be. If they choose the latter alternative they will no longer be under the necessity of building expensive buildings to accommodate crowds of Pass-Men ; and Fellows who were elected for their philosophical capacity will no longer instruct athletes in the rudiments of formal logic.

The development of such a University system will need money, and the University is poor. But Lord Curzon has made out a clear case for increased contributions from the colleges. The principles of a graduated income tax and super-tax might with advantage be applied. Moreover, he has already collected £140,000 towards the re-endowment of the University ; and that money could be applied much more usefully to making the University a national institution with its foundations in the loyalty of every class of the community, than in endowing faculties of commerce, engineering, and the like. The distinction between technical and liberal education has in the past been drawn too sharply, but it is a real distinction ; and Oxford's work is emphatically liberal education. Not every University can teach everything ; and technical studies do not require the traditions of seven hundred years and surroundings of the Middle Ages for their environment. The Humanities, on the other hand, do need such an environment, if they are to have

SAINT GEORGE

their full effect. The greatest educational privilege that any man can have is to be given three or four years in which he can learn something, in which he can without disturbance face the questions, "Who am I?" "What is this world and life in which I am placed?" "What have the greatest men who have asked these questions before me left behind them to assist me?"—and for such occupation Oxford must always offer the ideal conditions.

PHILOSOPHY AND ART

By ALEXANDER MAIR

R. JOHN BROWN once remarked that the studies of Metaphysics and medicine have more in common than may at first sight appear. This may also be said of Metaphysics and Art. There is a strong resemblance in their respective attributes towards experience. Both arise out of a discontent with the so-called "actual"—with facts in their raw state—with what is really the phenomenal or apparitional. This discontent is not of course to be overcome and abolished by turning away from "facts," but rather by prying more closely into them. In all fact there is some element of meaning and of beauty, but it does not always lie open to the casual observer ; it has to be sought for. The work of the artist and philosopher consists in this search for the ideal, which is also finally the real. They refuse to be fobbed off with appearances. In both undertakings there is an endeavour after, a deepening of insight into the character and significance of the presented facts of experience. In both there is a quest for that shy essence the Universal. In the case of Philosophy this is well recognized. But is it not also true in the case of Art ? Is it not Aristotle who speaks of the object of Art as the Universal in sensuous form. Art is like Philosophy, part of the struggle in which we are engaged against change. The artist, in so far as he achieves his end, enables humanity to triumph over Time, which is born of Change. The vision of Beauty once attained and fixed is ours for ever.

To some there may seem to be something quaint and even forced in this suggested connection between two apparently very diverse human interests. R. A. M. Stevenson in his book on

SAINT GEORGE

Velasquez divides men into those born to take pleasure in the speculative and abstract, and those born to love the concrete and sensuous—the black and white and the coloured mind. This represents the artistic, that the philosophic spirit. Then again, while the artistic consciousness is, speaking broadly, instinctive, the philosophic consciousness is discursive. A picture by Sir Noel Paton which had some vogue twenty years ago allegorized Reason and Faith by two sharply contrasted figures. The one was that of a dark and gloomy person, clad in complete armour, in the act of crossing a stream on stepping stones and testing carefully with the point of his sword his next foothold. The other figure, fair and effulgent, floated in air alongside. These will represent the philosophic and artistic types in the present regard as they are ordinarily conceived. The one has to make out his painful way step by step ; the other floats along on the wings of intuition or immediate inspiration. We hear of the artist as one who is

Content if he may but enjoy
The things which others understand.

We hear of the philosopher as possessed of a meddling intellect, as one who substitutes for the rich and coloured manifold of existence what Mr. F. H. Bradley designates as “a ghostly ballet of bloodless categories.” These same “bloodless categories” are the Universals of the philosopher which hold good not merely for the individual thinker—only for him indeed *qua* rational being—but which will be accepted as valid when clearly presented and understood by all reasoning creatures. Here, again, is an apparent disparity between Philosophy and Art. To mark the contrast, another statement by R. A. M. Stevenson may be quoted : “Personal taste counts for much in Art.” If one likes a piece of landscape or architecture, a melody, a picture, a poem, one likes it—and there an end. And so the painter, let us say, if challenged about his performance would seem to be entitled

PHILOSOPHY AND ART

to say with Goethe's *Kunstler*, "Was ich gemalt hab', hab' ich gemalt." We have to do here, that is to say, with an apparently individual judgment. The ground of validity lies not in the nature of the object, but in the attitude of a particular person towards it. The philosopher, on the other hand, if challenged about his position cannot take refuge in the fastness of personal opinion. It is not considered the thing for him to say, "What I believe that I believe." He must demonstrate, show forth the general grounds on which his position is based.

Undoubtedly there are differences, and striking differences, between the two pursuits. If there were not there would be no point in the attempt to show their connection. But do these differences constitute a fundamental cleavage? They do not. It does not follow, for instance, that because the artist works with a directness and spontaneity from which the philosopher is barred by the conditions of his task that what goes on in the consciousness of the artist is a non-rational process. The rational manifests itself in many ways. It is nothing to the point that the artist is not aware of the process or cannot describe it. It is a fortunate thing perhaps for him as artist that he has not arrived at the stage of self-consciousness, in this regard at any rate. It is not his *métier* to analyse his mental states. This remark, indeed, applies to most forms of human occupation as well as to that of artistry. In many departments of life people are continually carrying out complex rational processes of which they are never aware. They are only aware of the results; they could not tell you for any prize you might offer how these results were arrived at. The results are none the less good and worthy on that account.

The statement again that Philosophy is abstract and that Art is concrete is only relatively true. In the last resort the claim might be made for Philosophy that it is the most concrete of all enterprises. Its aim is to see and represent experience as a rational unity, as a whole. What could be

SAINT GEORGE

more concrete than that? In truth, it might be said that anything short of that is to the extent of its defect abstract. Philosophy, no doubt, is, in the progress towards this concrete end, analytic. It separates out the essential and relevant from the non-essential and irrelevant, but that is with a view to an ultimate construction. And Art for its own purposes and in its own manner does something very similar, as we may call Mr. Whistler to witness: "The artist is born to pick and choose and group with science the elements that the result may be beautiful—as the musician gathers his notes and forms his chords until he bring forth from chaos glorious harmony.

To say to the painter that Nature is to be taken as she is, is to say to the player that he may sit upon the piano."

And now we are face to face with a crucial if an ancient question—the question, namely, of the apparent individuality of the æsthetic judgment, the judgment of "taste" so-called contrasted with the universality of the logical judgment, the judgment of reason. On looking closely into the matter it becomes more and more difficult to believe that the judgment of taste is the highest or standard form of æsthetic judgment any more than the judgment of opinion is the highest form of logical judgment. The term "taste" is significant. It suggests that the recognition of beauty is an immediate and invincible experience, like a sensation. If an article tastes bitter to me, it is bitter for me. I cannot be argued out of that. And if an object is pleasing to me it is pleasing—and there is an end. But if a person should say this or that is true because it seems true to him, we have a right to demur. And as it is with judgments of Truth so it seems to be with regard to judgments of Beauty. The plausibility of the opposite contention appears to rest in the confusion between what is pleasure-giving and what is beautiful. The hedonistic fallacy here is similar to that in the region of ethics, where confusion between the pleasurable and the good has led to similar difficulties.

PHILOSOPHY AND ART

And it has been so adequately exposed in that connection that little remains to be said. It is clear that to say that an object is beautiful because it gives one pleasure, is not to furnish an adequate reason. Mr. Wells, no doubt, with a consistency which is striking, declares himself ready to speak of beautiful beer and beautiful cheese. To a person with a sense of humour this is in itself sufficient. Beer and cheese may or may not be beautiful ; if they are, it is not because they are good to drink or eat. One, no doubt, runs the risk of being accused of begging the question by asserting that only a selected number of the experiences which one likes refer to the beautiful, and that the *differentia* has still to be sought. But the facts are so plain before us that the risk is not considerable. The individualist and hedonist in Art is not always guiltless of *petitio principii* himself, for if pressed on the subject he may be often got to say that the things he calls beautiful because he likes them are liked because they are beautiful. If the measure of liking were the measure of the beautiful, many a music-hall jingle would stand above the "Pastoral Symphony," and the Sistine Madonna would have to give way to the grocer's almanac.

No ! Art rests on something more constant and durable than subjective like or dislike. It is true that æsthetic appreciation is steeped in a bright and warm emotional atmosphere, but this emotion is *aesthetic* emotion. It is the intellectual or, if you please, rational content of the experience which gives the emotion its specific character. One is reminded here of Matthew Arnold's definition of Religion as "Morality touched with emotion." On this it has been remarked that it is true but unilluminating, since the emotion referred to is *religious* emotion.

Each of these great human occupations and disciplines under consideration has a contribution to make to the other. The philosopher cannot let Art escape from his survey. Here must be significance. And so, almost from the beginnings of philosophic speculation, we find account taken of Art, an attempt

SAINT GEORGE

made to elicit from the consideration of its deeds and products some notion of its true nature, its function and purpose. A reference to a History of *Æsthetic* will show how steady and persistent reflection on these matters has been, and will also show that this reflection has not been fruitless. In making these enquiries Philosophy does not intend to legislate for Art, but only to attempt to explain ; it finds Art and wishes to understand it. So far as the individual artist is concerned, the results may or may not be of value according to his personal needs. Perhaps it is better that he should not be reflective and self-conscious. "The earlier and mightier painters," says Ruskin, "worked, I think, with the unpretending simplicity of all earnest men ; they did what they loved and felt ; they sought what the heart naturally seeks, and gave what it most gratefully receives, and I look to them on all points of principle as the most irrefragable authorities precisely on account of the child-like innocence which never deemed itself authoritative, but acted upon desire and not upon dicta, and sought for sympathy, not admiration." Artists, it is certain, who have tried to explain themselves and their work have not always succeeded. It is said that nearly every word Sir Joshua Reynolds wrote on the subject of Art was contrary to his practice, and it has been wittily remarked by Principal Shairpe that Wordsworth's own practice is the best antidote to the theory of poetry which he advances in the famous prefaces. If this does not show that the work of the artist is harder to explain than it is to achieve, it at least indicates that the gifts required for the two kinds of tasks are diverse. But occasionally they are found in combination. There have been great artists, like Goethe and Schiller, who have said illuminative things about their calling ; both of these names are to be found in the History of *Æsthetic*, as well as in the History of Art.

Though Art is an object of philosophic contemplation, just as Morality and Religion are, it does not follow that it any

PHILOSOPHY AND ART

more than they is subordinate to Philosophy. Schelling, indeed, though himself primarily a philosopher, says that while Philosophy attains the highest, it brings, so to speak, only a fraction of the man, whereas "Art brings the whole man as he is to the cognition of the highest, and that is the eternal distinction and marvel of Art." Mr. Bernard Shaw seems to be inclined in the opposite direction when he declares that the substitution of sensuous ecstasy for intellectual activity and honesty is "the very devil." But, then, Mr. Shaw does not identify sensuous ecstasy and Art. In a bold and designedly careless phrase he sweeps up Philosophy into Art when he speaks of the artist—"whether poet or philosopher." But the question of subordination need not be entered into particularly here. We can be content for the present to think of them as two disciplines of the human spirit striving after the highest, each with its own credentials and attractions—honourable equals with much in common. Both are rational in the profoundest sense of that word. Neither is merely reproductive—rather transformative or creative, if you like, each in its own medium penetrating, selecting, recombining the material of sense experience. Both are therefore useful in the highest degree. The achievement of their purposes is an end in itself, and through this achievement man is helped towards complete realization. To assist in the accomplishment of this is to be of the highest use. Both spring from the same source, and along different courses seek the same goal. They have as their effective motive belief in a harmonious universe, and each tries to realize and express this harmony in its own way. It is a significant though not a surprising fact that the great periods of philosophic activity have also been periods of artistic fruitfulness. For diverse though its manifestations may be, the human spirit is essentially a unity, and when stirred to its depths it may express itself in various modes, but its message is in substance the same.

JOHN RUSKIN¹

BY THE VERY REV. G. W. KITCHIN, D.D., DEAN OF DURHAM

IHAVE ventured to take for my motto an Indian proverb, new to me and telling ; it is also singularly true of our dear friend Mr. Ruskin.

It runs thus : "The torchbearer sees not his way." In Eastern jungles and morasses the torchbearer is dazzled by excess of light ; while he makes, for others following, the pathway clear and easy, he walks himself in trust, half-blindly, not knowing where he steps. He is not among Plato's runners, who as they run hand on the torch to one another—

λαμπάδια ἔχοντες διαδώσουσιν ἀλλήλοις
(Plato *Republic* 328A.)

for these fine-built Athenians strove in competition in the race ; and Ruskin abhorred all contests, and despised the commercial squalidity of daily competition. Enough for him to hold on high his light in the darkness ; for he ever believed that so he might make the ways of men more clear and firm, more God-fearing and heavenwards pointing, than their paths had hitherto been in the swarming and humming hive of English industry.

When M. de Bourrienne (Napoleon's secretary, who knew his strength and weakness intimately) ends the sketch of his late master's character, he sums up by saying that he was "in many ways an excellent subject for the acute exercise of a sound historic criticism—so complex he was, so unexpected, so incalculable." The same might well be said, though the subject is happier, of the career of Mr. Ruskin. For his utterances lend themselves to varied conclusions. We ask, What party—social, political, or religious—can claim him as their own ? A

¹ An address delivered at Sheffield to the Guild of Saint George, 22 May, 1909.

JOHN RUSKIN

stiff Tory? or a vehement Socialist? Did he lay himself out to teach the gilded youth of Oxford? or rather, did he enlighten the overstrained workman of the North? As he himself re-echoes with joy Tennyson's cry in "Akbar's Dream," "Sometimes I walk a cathedral cloister, sometimes I bare my feet in a Turkish mosque." These varied acts were at one with his inner and very real sense of devotion to the Almighty giver of good; they testified to his hope for the uplifting of man's spirit above the sorrowful dust of our daily labour and life.

At no time in his life is this so plain as when he sorrowfully abandoned that first ambition of his, the hope, that men of leisure and society would listen to his voice, and carry on and realize his ideals of human duty. His keen disappointment did not lessen his eagerness for his brethren: he was no Ajax sulking in his tent because he could not have his way. If Oxford undergraduates would not listen, or idly came to hear and laugh, he would turn from them to the far more difficult task of endeavouring to interest and influence the mass of English and Scottish workers.

This change in his point of view took place nearly half a century ago. Mr. Frederic Harrison says of him that the publication of *Unto this Last* was the sign of this change. "It," he says, "*was the central book of his life, as it is the turning-point of his career.*" Ere this, he had worshipped Art as the moral and honest expression of a man's best nature: henceforward he taught morality as the basis of Art and of the lives of men. Before this, his circumstances attached him to the cultivated classes; after this he turned to the working men, and became the unpopular teacher of the downtrodden and neglected. Small wonder that Society was angry, and his prophecy and preaching met with that cultivated contempt and derision that naturally befall one who steps out of the common run.

SAINT GEORGE

From that moment Ruskin unconsciously challenged the whole breadth of modern Economics. By proclaiming the absolute value of morality and sweetness of life as elements of a sound state, he attacked the principle of the *laissez faire*, or *laissez perir* of the Manchester School, and incidentally declared war against the Manchester system of making fortunes out of the labour of the hands toiling in the masters' mills.

Yet when he did this, it seems as if he had been wrapt aloft by the spirit of a coming age of humanity ; for he was quite unconscious of the truth that he was then striking the first chord of that new harmony of life which is yet still among the hopeful things of the future. In all this it is true that the prophet passed away from this life without being aware that he was leading into a better way the mass of his fellow-countrymen. To be the forerunner of a new world and never to realize that fact was in his case the penalty of being the torch-bearer.

The history of this remarkable little book is quite worthy of being set down here, when we are engaged trying to understand what the country owes to Mr. Ruskin's guidance.

In 1860 Thackeray, who was then editor of the young *Cornhill Magazine*, accepted from him the offer of some papers on Economics. When however the four essays appeared they "were reprobated" (I am using Mr. Ruskin's own account of it all) "in a violent manner by most of the readers they met with." And then Ruskin goes on characteristically to declare that he believed them "to be the best, i.e. the truest, rightest-worded, and most serviceable things I have ever written ; and the last of them, having had especial pains spent on it, is probably the best I shall ever write." And to emphasize his opinion still more he adds in a note : "This book, which, being the most precious, in its essential contents, of all that I have ever written, I reprint word for word and page for page, after that addition (to the Preface), and make it as accessible as I can to all."

JOHN RUSKIN

And this little book, he tells us, is intended to give us the true meaning of certain words—specially of “wealth” and “honesty.” “The real gist of these papers, their central meaning and aim, is to give, as I believe for the first time in plain English, a logical definition of Wealth”; and then he adds as his second object, that he will show us “that the acquisition of Wealth is finally possible only under certain *moral conditions* of Society, of which quite the first was a belief in the existence, and even, for practical purposes, in the attainability of Honesty.”

Here, then, is the declaration of a great warfare to be waged in the present and future by all who love their country, and have in them something of that discredited quality, Patriotism—the determination to make as good, as pure, and as true, as they can the members of our country; and to bring England back, where such a return is possible, to the archaic faith in the possibilities of true justice of man with man.

This, then, was the aim of this little book. How did it fare? Thackeray, bowing to the sacred voice of Society, shut his door on it: but the mischief was done! Not only is the word spoken a thing done; but in this case the opposition fanned it into a great flame. Slowly at first, Smith, Elder and Co. brought the book out in 1862; at the end of ten years the little edition was not exhausted: they still had 102 copies on hand, which, they assured Ruskin, would safely meet two years' sale—so little at first did the work create a stir. Afterwards he transferred it to the now well-known Mr. George Allen, of Orpington in Kent, who in 1877 issued a larger edition. Then came swift life. A third edition was called for in 1882; then, more quickly still, a fourth in 1884. From this point the sale of the book, expensive though it is for working men, has steadily grown, and Mr. Allen tells me that at the opening of the present century the annual sale of it has been, on the average, nearly three thousand and a half; and that in many editions. One cannot overrate so strong a proof of the permanent effect of this little

SAINT GEORGE

book. In the middle of last century there were two prophets about the evils of the competition system, two protesters against the pernicious *laissez faire* system of Mill's day. Men so different! the one grim, rough, disappointed, earnest as a Puritan; the other lovable, gentle, and kind to all, with the broadness of a Scottish gentleman. These were Carlyle, who with his grim anger at the evils of his day launched many a thunderbolt at the "dismal science," and his denunciations had effect, no doubt, in rousing attention; while the other prophet, whom we are now honouring, built up in his *Unto this Last* a definite system, which Carlyle never attempted, a system which meant a great change in matters of Economics. He began with the technical words and cries of the older way—the true definition of value, of wealth, of expenditure, and of the use of things, as the opposite to the older system of accumulating capital in a few hands, with poverty and sweating, and what we (perhaps unjustly) style the Jewish way of making a fortune.

And what a boon it was to a sweating society, running madly after money, to have the serene voice and broadminded spirit of our prophet, warning us of the evils, and pointing out, with eloquence that all must love and be drawn by, how the accredited system of national economics was leading us all the wrong way and how it was ruining all those things which for us English folk had been matters for praise and joy. It is one of the points of solace, when one looks into our friend's later life, to find that in 1892 (published in that year, but written apparently earlier) he tells us in the Preface to his *Sesame and Lilies*, VII, that: "One of my friends put me in no small pet by saying that he thought my own influence was much more in being amiable and obliging than in writing books!" (What a blind owl! Was he not really always delightfully kind, and even that weak thing "amiable"; ever glad to put himself out lovingly to be "obliging" to many an idle and silly person who presumed on his great kindness?) The passage then goes on: "I begged

JOHN RUSKIN

him, with some warmth, to observe that there were myriads of at least equally good-natured people in the world who had merely become its slaves if not its victims; but that the influence of my book was distinctly on the increase, and I hoped, etc., etc.—it is no matter what I said."

Still, how we should have loved to hear how high his hopes for his brethren had risen, under the sunrise of the beginnings of popular appreciation. On the other hand, I can say, from my own memory, which goes into some of his ways of thinking towards the end of his days, that there was always brooding in his mind a perpetual sense that he had failed to impress his humane and clear views on the popular mind. Nay, he was ever fond of saying, when one referred with praise to this or that matter in his *Præterita*, that he "regretted having written it as he had done—and that if he had to do it now, it would have been very different." It was a painful feeling in his failing mind and strength, that his efforts had not borne their right results; and that the better way so splendidly pointed out by him had not been trodden by the crazy world—a world rushing madly, blindly, down the horrid hill of competition to destruction.

Not very long after the first issuing of this little book I was present at a meeting in Oxford of a club of tutors and friends, who discussed, now and then, the economic problems of the day. On the night I was there they were listening to a paper by a man whom death carried away from us, just when his great abilities and force of character had been at last understood and appreciated by the censorious and sensitive Oxford graduate world. It was Dr. Hatch, who was in fact, at the time feeling for the right way of dealing with a subject, so full of interest, and of such high importance for English welfare—yet hedged in by many interests. "Should," he asked, "Political Economy be based on a Deductive or on an Inductive form of reasoning and enquiry?" That is, should

SAINT GEORGE

the student decide on first principles first, and then deduce from them the laws which should govern production and efficiency? Or should the student begin at the other end, following the example of Bacon, Lord Verulam, in his *Novum Organum*, and busying himself first with the accumulation of pertinent facts; classifying them in due order, and so building up a solid system of economics? In his discussion there was a leaning towards the second manner: for the other way, that of axioms (that were no axioms at all), showed him that the Deductive form of argument was liable to infinite blunders; for a false axiom would create a swarm of terrible results, while a humble classification of single facts might not rise very high: but it could on the whole be trusted.

One could see that he felt the hollowness of the then current system; for it was based on such axioms as these; such as "Trade, like water, finds the easiest way"; or "Capital is the essential feature of economics"; or "The Devil take his hindmost"; or "The State should stand aloof, giving facilities, but not interfering"; or "Buy in the cheapest, sell in the dearest market."

With such axioms one can now see what evils would result. Enormous accumulations in a few hands; a constant struggle and resistance of all others: a most abominable doctrine of "thrift," which hinders a wise and remunerative expenditure, leading to the miser-doctrine of great capital accumulated in few hands.

Such was the treatment then given to this matter, a matter of life and death to the whole nation. It had never occurred to my friend there—or to any of those who discussed the matter afterwards that evening—that there was a something absolutely missing from their "view" of the subject—the one something on which Mr. Ruskin had already made his noble declaration; and this, you will anticipate me, is the recognition of the *moral side of human nature*, and the action of all those

JOHN RUSKIN

not frozen qualities which made the difference between breathing human work and the stiff issues of machinery. At the opening of the book Ruskin strikes his special note. "Among all the delusions which at different periods have possessed themselves of the minds of the human race, perhaps the most curious—certainly the least creditable—is the modern *soi-disant* science of Political Economy—based on the idea that an advantageous code of social action may be determined irrespectively of the influence of social affection. The social affections, says the economist, are accidental and disturbing elements in human nature; but advance and the desire of progress are constant elements"—and in reply Ruskin asserts bravely "that all endeavour to deduce rules of action from balance of expediency is in vain. For no human actions ever were intended by the Maker of men to be guided by balances of expediency, but by balances of justice"; and by "balances of justice," he goes on, "meaning, in the term justice, to include affection—such affection as one man *owes* to another."

Here, then, is the keynote to the master's treatment of the business side of human arrangements: the very antipodes of the current hard-featured system of economics, of which, by long struggles and often misguided efforts—such as strikes in a falling market, or some fury of desire for more than a just share of profits—have caused infinite suffering and distress, and have thrown whole trades out of gear, and form a flagrant invitation to our neighbours to take up what we in our blindness have thrown down. And then, if the foreigner listens, and takes advantage of our blindness, we turn round and clamour that he should be hustled out, rather than that we should be punished for our own mistakes. Not amiss does the teacher end one of his strongest appeals by saying, "Whether among national manufactures that of souls of a good quality may not be the most lucrative. Nay!" [with a burst of his splendid imaginative powers] "Nay, in some far-away and yet undreamt-

SAINT GEORGE

of hour, I can even imagine that England may cast all thoughts of possessive wealth back to the barbaric nations among whom they first arose ; and that, while the sands of the Indies and adamant of Golconda may yet stiffen the housings of the charger and flash from the turban of the slave, she, as a Christian mother, may at last attain to the virtues and the treasures of a heathen one, and be able to lead forth her sons, saying—‘These are my jewels.’”—(*Unto This Last*, 65.)

This then is the supreme quality of his views as to social life in England : and who can doubt of the effect of this, in a day when the relations between the master and the worker are rapidly changing, under the influence of these noble ideals of the relation of man to man ? “There is no wealth but life,” he cries ; and then tries to make us understand that we must see that life is rightly grown, and endeavour to carry out those happy precepts which, if we have eyes to see, are graven in the records of Christianity.

I only know of one earlier prophet, who treated social questions, as Ruskin did, in the light of moral duties ; few have ever had the hearts to strike so passionate, so true and so sound a note as rings through this little book. This was an obscure writer of the sixteenth century, who judged of economic matters by the higher law of the Gospel—Dean Wilson, one of my predecessors at Durham. He had passed through strange adventures in his earlier days, and in mature and peaceful days wrote a little book, a dialogue or conference on Usury, a book now so rare that only a few copies of it are known to exist. It carried to the farthest point the brotherly duties of man to man ; so far indeed that he threatens those who accept any interest for a loan to help a friend as traitors to be condemned by the Christian community. His vehemence and determination that all should be guided by the higher principles of brotherhood made him a man who would have hailed gladly Mr. Ruskin’s solution of

JOHN RUSKIN

these affairs. He argued that in a Christian nation no one could, without turning his back on the profession of his faith, take any advantage of his neighbour. He should therefore gladly let his struggling brother have such ready money as he needs, without interest at all. This now forgotten book was powerless, though backed up by a warm letter from Bishop Jewel. At any rate, Queen Elizabeth gave him—though he was a layman, and must have regarded such a strange dignitary's place with something like astonishment—the Deanery of Durham as a reward for zealous work in many ways. He held it for under two years, dying in 1581 in London.

Apart from him, I believe we may say truly that Ruskin was the sole and only beginner, in the literary history of English economics, of that higher belief, that man's life "consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth." It is indeed, when rightly viewed, a noble fabric, built up on honour, and honour pure is honesty : so lifting all business to the higher plane of life, and scorning the falsehoods, advertisements and subterfuges of the race for success. "Mammon service," he cries aloud, "is the irreconcileable opposite of God's service ; and whenever the divine writings speak of riches absolute and poverty absolute, they declare woe to the rich and blessing to the poor. Whereupon we forthwith investigate *a science of becoming rich as the shortest road to national prosperity*" (*Unto This Last*, 104).

As to our friend's commendation of Government shops, and with them and the abolition of out-of-works, we can say nothing. The examples in history of such efforts are not encouraging. Nor would Government rule and patronage carry out his aphorism that "the best work is never done for money."

The great truth we have been looking at is summed up by the noble Venetian motto, quoted by him as the keynote of his work : "Around this temple let the merchant's law

SAINT GEORGE

be just, his weights true, his contracts guileless" (note in Preface xv.).

And though he closed his eyes, while the world around seemed more and more engrossed with money-getting, still the dawn had come, though he saw it not ; and we now can point to many proofs, at home and abroad, of true, honest fellowship in labour, and of a belief in something better in life than that "red gold" which still too many worship with all their hearts.

I have lingered, it may be, too long over this phase of Mr. Ruskin's life : for it seems to me to be the side on which his spirit was most in earnest and most sorrowful at the non-attainment of his desires for his fellow-countrymen. And also because it has been already, and will, I trust, ever be, the beginning of a beneficial change in the English view as to a wise economy, no longer Carlyle's "dismal science," but instead a happy opening of a new and better age of English commercial and social activity and prosperity.

There are, however, many more important sides of our friend's career, which, as far as his own opinion went, were never fully realized by the people of his day. In all these brave utterances of his there was the selfsame spirit. It was the spirit of what was true and genuine in art, in morals, in religion. We all know how he fought against the falsities into which all art seemed to fall in the early times of our late beloved Queen—the vigorous championship with which he defended the rising school of *Præ-raphaelites*, as they were called ; the hot support of Turner's splendid art ; the withering scorn with which he resisted all sham-work, all feeble prettiness. In those days it was all too true that England had a flood of works in bad taste—whether in painting or in architecture. We have not yet shaken ourselves clear of this taint. Any one who has ever studied Ruskin's architectural drawings will see where his strength lay—it lay in honesty and truthfulness ; there was no sparing of labour ; no eagerness for effect

JOHN RUSKIN

—nothing but the reproduction of some work of old genius, which had been blessed by some double blessing of age and rightness of pious labour.

I wish I could do justice to his noble work for the purifying of art from the blighting influences of working for money, not for art itself. I always remember an awful statue, bigger than life-size, in one of the London exhibitions, portraying horror, haste, pain, an almost dying fury. I said to the sculptor that it seemed to me to run counter to all Lessing's famous rules for plastic art : it had neither repose nor beauty in it. The answer was : "I know that is so! But my object was to call attention to myself as a rising sculptor ; and it will have the desired effect." Let us hope it had ; and that my friend the sculptor has since made a fortune. But it was an arrant example of what should not have been achieved. And on the other side, how marked is the work of many modern Italian sculptors—as we saw them some years back in a London exhibition ! Such wonderful technical work, so much expenditure of skill—but no noble thought or inspiration ; just beautiful forms and faces, half concealed, half hinted by exquisite draperies. Suitable for West End luxurious drawing-rooms ; but with no inspired element in them.

Against these twin forms of decadence how bravely did the master contend throughout his life ! And he saw but little abatement of the evil. His sorrowful saying that "the best work is never done for money" is daily proved true, when we compare the old builders with our stiff efforts, the old sculptors with our modern street decorations, the old painters with our gaudy exhibitions. No wonder that these things weighed heavily on him to the very end.

I have occupied too much of your time already, and must draw towards the close. May I venture to say with what pleasure I have seen this remarkable collection of things beautiful adorning your most active and ever-growing city ? One cannot guess

SAINT GEORGE

at the effect of such a museum and such an influence as that of Mr. Ruskin, whose generous action showed us long ago that when he had turned away from the colder world of the University of Oxford, he did not withdraw into the quiet of a well-earned peace in old age, but at once set himself to appeal to, to rouse, to teach, the workers of our country. It was a noble change for him ; and will, let us hope, ever lead to a large uplifting of the minds of those who are in reality the solid element of our varied society—the element which works manfully to create all things of use and some things for the delight of a civilized life. Nowhere is it so much needed as it is in the huge aggregations of mankind—nowhere so much as in places in which the reign of machinery is powerful.

Long may the name of John Ruskin be connected honourably with the civic life of this city. You can never vie with his beloved Venice ; but it is a great boon that you can here learn much of the marvellous beauty of that wonderful city of the waters. I see that in this year you have already had discourses on the Venetian St. Ursula, and the other splendid examples of Carpaccio's work in the renowned St. George's of Venice. The Sclavonians, who visited England in the fifteenth and sixteenth century, came from that settlement in Venice itself, and touched the traffic and merchandise of Southern England by their higher sense of beauty and true artistic work. Why should not Sheffield with its splendid energy and power over metal-work, draw a wholesome breath of life from these reminiscences of past excellence ; and presently show to the English world a pattern of that honourable goodness in labour, which will turn the hardship of the lot of man into a new world, a world of higher aspirations and true expression in art ? Thus the needful in daily life will be touched throughout with the spirit of Ruskin's highest aims ; and you will cry with him, as he appeals to women in his *Queens' Gardens* :

JOHN RUSKIN

"Come, thou south wind, and breathe upon my garden, that the spices of it may flow out"¹ (*Queens' Gardens*, iv. 16).

¹ Cp. the Preface to *St. Mark's Rest*, written at Brantwood in 1878 : "The only doctrine or system peculiar to me is the abhorrence of all that is doctrinal instead of demonstrable, and of all that is systematic instead of useful : so that *no* true disciple of mine will ever be a 'Ruskinian'!—he will follow not me but the instincts of his own soul, and the guidance of its Creator."

UTOPIAN PAPERS¹

BY JAMES GLENDINNING

WHILE publishers and booksellers (both increasingly forgetful that they are great, if merely secondary, social instruments for the dissemination of imagination and art, of knowledge and culture) nervously excite themselves over the purely commercial relations of the sevenpenny reprint and the six-shilling first-edition of fiction—and, be it noted, increase their excitement and their difficulties by a somewhat reckless speculation in both ; and while the public, quietly and unconsciously, as its lack or its possession of wealth, taste, and leisure operates, settles the matter, good, solid, unostentatious works that appeal to idealism and thought rather than to physical emotion and activity—works that demand, if they are to be incorporated into our being, the exercise of a ruminant rather than a merely molar faculty—are apt to be pulped, or, at best, to receive their only notice in a catalogue of remainders. Milton, we are often told, with an intonation and gesture of tragedy, received a paltry £10 for his *Paradise Lost*. And the intonation and gesture incline us, at first, to enter that humble cottage in Chalfont-St-Giles—once so beautiful, and an incentive to the regaining of Paradise ; now, alas, fast becoming, through inevitable social circumstance, an integral part of a rural slum—and present the shade of the blind poet with our bank and cheque books ; but second

¹ *Utopian Papers.* Being Addresses to “The Utopians.” By Professor Patrick Geddes, S. H. Swinny, Dr. J. W. Slaughter, V. V. Branford, Dr. Lionel Tayler, Sister Nivedita, F. W. Felkin, and Rev. Joseph Wood. Edited by Dorothea Hollins. (London : Masters and Co., Ltd., 3s. 6d. net.)

UTOPIAN PAPERS

thoughts make us linger on the threshold and transfer our wondering commiseration to his generation and to our own. Milton, presumably, signed receipts for £10 to his publisher. Who shall dare to draw up the receipt of humanity to Milton?

Be it not inferred from this that *Utopian Papers* is a new *Paradise Lost*, or, though it points the way thither, a new *Paradise Regained*. It is simply a volume of careful, conscientious thought—with two veins of genuine inspiration which we shall deal with presently—written in straightforward prose. It may have involved financial relations of £10 or of £10,000: we care not a bodele; what we do care for, is that it shall have intellectual and practical relations with the public at large. It will doubtless find no place in any manual of English literature; but parts of it, at least—the veins of genuine inspiration we have already referred to, certainly—demand a place in something infinitely deeper and higher—English life. For what is life but the alternate—or, rather, the simultaneous—losing and regaining of Paradise, of Utopia; the sincere and constant relation of ideals to conduct, the sincere and constant criticism of self in both, the constant and inevitable rebuilding or destruction of oneself as ideals and conduct harmonize more or less completely in quality and in intensity? And it is just here, as an incentive and guide to the formulation and the practice of individual and social ideals, that the volume under review is of vital and intrinsic value. *Utopian Papers* is a misnomer, for the net result of the volume is to throw a flood of light and reason upon the actual here in space, and upon the actual past and present and the potential future in time.

The volume consists of a series of addresses delivered to “The Utopians,” a little group of Chelsea citizens keenly interested in the welfare of their borough and equally interested also, as all good citizens should be, in the problems, activities, and welfare of humanity. In two ways have “The Utopians” publicly justified their existence—first, by providing the

SAINT GEORGE

nucleus of the lately-formed Chelsea Association, a body organized for the purpose of realizing something of Utopia in Chelsea here and now ; and, secondly, by producing the present volume. They have recognised, in short, that Utopia is to be visualized clearly and ultimately—if ever—reached only by the continuous co-operation of faith, reason and works,—the only way to reach any heaven, howsoever mundane and humble.

The variety of subjects with which the volume deals will be sufficiently appreciated if we simply set forth the titles of the addresses which form the contents : “Chelsea, Past and Possible,” by Professor Patrick Geddes ; “Some Utopias Past and Present,” by the Rev. Joseph Wood ; “The Utopian Imagination and Social Progress,” by Dr. J. W. Slaughter ; “St. Columba,” by Victor V. Branford ; “Comte’s View of the Future of Society,” by S. H. Swinny ; “Goethe,” by F. W. Felkin ; “Indian Thought,” by Sister Nivedita ; “The Innate Capacity for Self-Development,” by Dr. J. Lionel Tayler. We propose to deal exclusively with the pages written by Professor Geddes and Mr. Branford—this, however, in no way derogatory to the other articles in the volume, which, indeed, all reach a high level of thought and suggestion ; but simply because it seems to us that “Chelsea, Past and Possible” and “St. Columba” are marked out by qualities of extraordinary originality, and give very definite and quite indispensable aid to the realization of any worthy Utopia, individual or social.

“Chelsea, Past and Possible” will give its full meaning and significance only to those who are acquainted with Professor Geddes’s previous and later writings on Civics—a body of matter relatively small in bulk, but easily first, in quality, in the literature of its subject. The author might well have presented his argument with greater wealth of detail and illustration ; but brief and compressed though the article is, it is a valuable contribution to the elaboration of a philosophy and

UTOPIAN PAPERS

a practice of civics that cannot but have a profound influence upon the civic life and policy of the future. On another occasion we hope to deal, in *Saint George*, with Professor Geddes's philosophy and practice of civics; for the present we merely seek to disengage some of the more important points presented by the article under review.

The article is offered

as a suggestion towards the interpretation of an individual borough, and especially of some of the ways in which our knowledge of and respect for local tradition may not only enhance our interest in the present, but assist our outlook towards the future. The historic retrospect, the Utopian forecast [the author continues] too often mutually exclusive, must thus be united; for an evolutionary interpretation is not merely an enquiry into antecedents, but an endeavour to define the general course of events, to discern its elements of enduring inheritance, and of contemporary variation. Nor is this enlarged enquiry of purely scientific interest; in the measure of its clearness, it affords indications towards action, and this especially as regards the selection and preservation, the continuance and culture of the vital and characteristic elements of our local heritage. In short, historic appreciation and Utopian anticipation must be increasingly united to bring forth fruit in civic aspiration and endeavour.

That at once lifts the matter of civics far above the plane on which our rival parties of municipal politicians so joyfully contend. Our current municipal politics has not yet developed into civics; it is, indeed, often little more than a violent obscuring of the fundamental facts of civics; the stimulation of class or party prejudice and interest at the expense of communal life and well-being. Rates are considered in their purely monetary aspect, and not in terms of social service needed and performed. Birth-rates and death-rates are rightly regarded as matters of vital importance; but what we may call life-rates—or, to put it in another way, the opportunity and stimulus which the community may give to the capacity

SAINT GEORGE

for making the most of life, both individual and communal—are considered only in the most rudimentary and haphazard fashion. Drains, sanitary inspection, free education, libraries, open spaces, and a thousand and one other things are, it is true, provided—and their increasing provision marks an enormous advance in our civic sense—but all these advances are made not as the result of a comprehensive and organic conception of civics, but mainly as the result of social necessity or of specialized and organized public opinion; and while these several advances are made, counter-forces are permitted to operate and so undo much of the good that is achieved. No social Utopia can be reached save by a long and complex process of inter-related reforms; and the prime condition on which reforms shall be reforms in the vital sense of the word is that they shall deal not only with present conditions and needs, but that they shall also take account of the heritage of the past, and be related, so far as a wise foresight permits, to the probable conditions and needs of the future. In other words, if our civic Utopia is not to be a jerry-built thought-structure—like the material environment in which we plan it—it must have its foundations in a comprehensive knowledge of the past and the present which we purpose it shall supersede. Call them cornets, and blow through them as lustily or as sweetly as we may, the traditional trumpets will never rebuild the walls of our particular Jericho.

It will be seen, from the quotation we have given above, that in Professor Geddes's conception of civics historic appreciation and Utopian anticipation are great and indispensable elements. Too often historic appreciation and Utopian anticipation are found rigidly back to back, the one lamenting a phantom sunset, the other hailing an equally phantom dawn; and whether found separately or combined, both are too often arrested at the stage of idle dreaming, or of equally idle criticism of present realities, instead of becoming what is their

UTOPIAN PAPERS

only real justification—*incentives and guides to the understanding and the reshaping of the present, elements of a union of regional sociology and practical civic policy.*

This union of historic retrospect and Utopian anticipation with an intellectual and practical interest in the conditions, the needs and the possibilities of the present involves, for its efficient realization, regional and civic surveys. Obviously such surveys must take a wider view than those of which Mr. Charles Booth's survey of London is a monumental and classic example, for they must be surveys of past, present, and potential future, and of each in their complex relations of time and space and of natural and social circumstance. Further, such surveys necessitate the creation of a civic museum for each city and town. In such museums

records of the past, surveys of the present, projects and suggestions for the future, may for the first time be brought together. Public feeling and individual interest are thus aroused—the very deficiencies of this threefold collection being, perhaps, no less suggestive than its contents—and improvement becomes possible accordingly. Our ideas of our city, thus beginning with observations and records, generalize towards unity of view, towards common action also. For given such and such elements of the local heritage, especially those which have reappeared in generation after generation, given too such and such advantages of the local situation in our own day, practical possibilities appear, and from these the conception of a Civic Policy begins to arise.

Such regional and civic surveys, and such civic museums, afford the only valid and permanent incentive to, and basis for, the co-operation of the many active elements of that civic awakening which is becoming more and more general in our country to-day. Without some such incentive and basis, pageants, Town Planning Bills, Garden City movements, Borough and City Councils, too, tend to remain isolated factors in civic progress, and are thus robbed of much of their

SAINT GEORGE

potential influence ; with such an incentive and basis—even though they be still only in an elementary stage—

In Chelsea, small local groups, like the Utopians, small beginnings, like that of University Hall of Residence, tend to become associated in endeavours of citizenship ; such are the recent formation of a nucleus of a Chelsea Association, and that of a General Committee for the re-erection of Crosby Hall.

Professor Geddes's opening words to the Utopians of Chelsea are of universal application :—

Let me first plead that we should take a more active and definite interest in our borough. At the outset I submit that we hardly any of us adequately know our facts, and hence that we cannot even dream our Utopia more than vaguely, much less define any single portion of it until we have come to know and understand something at least of what it is that gives this local character which we value to our neighbourhood, our town.

Briefly and succinctly, therefore, he disengages from the history of Chelsea what it is that gives it its distinctive character. Its main and secondary memorials ; its association with Count Zinzendorf and thence with the Thirty Years' War ; with the Moravians and thence with that great bishop and pedagogue, Comenius ; with More and Erasmus, and thence with the Reformation and the Renaissance ; with Sir Hans Sloane and his nucleus of the British Museum ; with Turner, Rossetti, and Whistler ; with Carlyle : these and other associations, direct or secondary, are briefly dealt with, and are made to lead up naturally to the illuminating conclusion :—

Here in Chelsea, albeit but one of the minor boroughs of London as regards area, wealth, population, and other crude quantitative measurements, we have a city in its own way second to none, and in general view claiming to be reckoned after the City and Westminster themselves as making up the main triad of Central London. True, the City stood for commerce,

UTOPIAN PAPERS

for material wealth, financial greatness, and Westminster for sacred traditions and for governing powers, when this was but a country village. Yet when the Reformation closed the story of Westminster as a mediæval cloister of thought, the history of Chelsea opened, as its Renaissance equivalent or analogue, and as since affording once and again some needed subjective counterpart to the material and political greatness of the two Metropolitan cities. In many ways, of course, this position, while here in Chelsea but individually and sporadically realized, has been more fully and consciously taken as well as educationally applied by Oxford; but while that has been mainly a citadel of the causes and ideals of the past, the record of Chelsea . . . lies essentially in its initiatives of new ideals, of constructive movements. Here in fact has long been established, not indeed More's *Utopia*, yet another and practically contemporary one, that *Abbey of Thelema*, in which each lives his own life to such purpose as he may.

This, then, is the tradition, the distinctive character, of Chelsea—the “perpetual renewal of certain recognizable elements.” To recognize these elements, and yet to regard Chelsea merely as a thing of the past, is to grasp only half of its meaning and purpose.

Though to historians and their readers the past may too often seem dead, or at best a record to be enshrined in libraries for the learned, it is of the very essence of our growing sociological re-interpretation of the past to see its essential life as continuous into the present, and even beyond, and so maintain the perennation of culture, the immortality of the social soul. The definition of culture in terms of “the best that has been known and done in the world” is but half the truth, that which mourns or meditates among the tombs; the higher meaning of culture is also nearer its primitive sense, which finds in the past not only fruit but seed, and so prepares for a coming spring, a future harvest. History is not ended with our historians’ “periods”; the world is ever beginning anew, each community with it, each town and quarter. Why not then also this small town of ours, this most productive cloister of thought and art in what is now the vastest of historic cities?

To continue the past tradition into the opening future is, then, “the problem, the essence of our Utopia.” That

SAINT GEORGE

problem is, unfortunately, only briefly considered by Professor Geddes in his present article ; but brief though the treatment is, it affords innumerable and valuable suggestions to the careful reader ; and perhaps Professor Geddes will give us, in the near future, a fuller exposition of the means by which the problem is to be solved. For the present, these means are indicated. The recently formed Chelsea Association affords the nucleus of an organization which may co-ordinate and give a common civic purpose to the many isolated or but loosely related agencies which are seeking to promote the well-being of the communal and the individual life of Chelsea. It is surely the experience of all who are engaged in civic work of any kind, however important or however humble, that it is only in proportion as that work is brought into direct and continuous contact with the other innumerable local activities that it finds its full civic expression and achievement. Some day, perhaps, our City and Borough Councils will be the co-ordinating body ; but so long as these public bodies are dominated by a spirit of party politics instead of by a spirit of constructive civics, the co-ordinating body must essentially be of a less official and more truly representative character. So far, then, Professor Geddes does well to lay emphasis upon the civic functions and possibilities of the Chelsea Association. Such an association, however, is needed by every community ; and each community will present its association with certain very definite local problems in addition to those that will necessarily be common to all. What special problem confronts the Chelsea Association ? The tradition of many cultural activities is, as we have seen, the essential tradition of Chelsea. Obviously, then, the special problem of the Chelsea Association is to continue these cultural activities in the present and into the opening future ; to breathe new life into the centuries-old tradition ; to make it once more a living force within Chelsea and an influence beyond its boundaries. The time has come for that.

UTOPIAN PAPERS

"As the community in its religious aspect was the Church, as the community in its political aspect is the State, so also the community in its cultural aspect will be the University"; and in Chelsea now are the essentials of a University City in the general sense; and a University quarter, in the literal sense, is now developing. These two beginnings—the nucleus of a Chelsea Association and the nucleus of a University City—must therefore be brought together; and towards this great civic purpose the re-erection of Crosby Hall—now begun—upon More's Garden, is

no mere act of archæological piety, still less of mere "restoration," but one of renewal; it is a purposeful symbol, a renewed initiative, Utopian and local, civic and academic in one. It is first of all a renewed link with the past and its associations; it is to be of daily uses, both public and collegiate, but these above all as preparing for the future, not simply dignifying the present and commemorating the past. In sum it is a new link between Chelsea Past and Chelsea Possible.

Such then is the substance—with a little comment—of this addition to the elaboration of a philosophy and practice of civics that may well become the most potent influence in that civic renaissance that is, happily, increasingly characteristic of our time.

In the next issue of *Saint George* we shall deal with Mr. Victor Branford's article on "St. Columba"—at once an extremely original contribution to hagiography and an illuminating interpretation of certain elemental facts of life.

THE GOVERNMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

By WALTER T. LAYTON

WHEN the achievements of the present Parliament come to be written, it is safe to say that there will be two outstanding features in its record which will attract the attention of the future historian. Its confidence in the principle of self-government, as shown in the grant of constitutions to the South African colonies, is one. The other is its far-reaching scheme of social legislation. While the first was a carrying out, under peculiarly difficult circumstances, of a great tradition, the latter represents in many ways a breaking of new ground. Lord Rosebery has characterized Mr. Lloyd George's finance as a *Revolution*, not a *Budget*. But the innovations in the Budget are as nothing compared to the social revolution which is being effected, so far as legislation can accomplish it. Of the measures either passed or under consideration only two amplify and extend Acts already on the Statute book, and in one at least of these cases a very radical advance is made on the previous enactment. The list includes :—Small Holdings, Old Age Pensions, Workmen's Compensation, Trades' Disputes, the Miners' Eight Hours Act, which for the first time fixes by legislation hours of adult men, Trades' Boards, Labour Exchanges, Invalidity Insurance, and Unemployed Insurance. We might add to the list whatever measures the Government may propose next year for reforming the Poor Law, and also the administrative work of the Board of Trade in settling industrial disputes, with the formation of their Conciliation Board panels of employers and employed. The latter is not strictly legislation, but it represents an expansion of the functions of Government.

THE GOVERNMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

The newest and most experimental of these changes have been reserved for this present year. Four great schemes have, in fact, been propounded in the last three months. Of these Invalidity Insurance is not fully developed, but is forecast in outline in the Budget. Of the Bills reserved for the present year, that which proposes to establish Labour Exchanges has attracted most attention. The scheme for Unemployment Insurance is postponed till next year, but it is so bound up in the former that they should be considered together. In conjunction they form the first step for dealing with the question of Unemployment. The problem of the inefficient and of those displaced by the better organization of casual labour, the question of how best to meet periods of exceptional depression, all these remain for future consideration. At the present moment it is important to secure as wide and as general a discussion of the proposals which are actually before the country.

In making labour exchanges the main point in their policy the Government have the authority of both reports of the Poor Law Commission, each of which insists that the problem of casual labour and what has come to be known as Under-Employment is the most pressing question calling for a solution. "Of all the forms of Unemployment," say the Minority, "that which we have termed Under-Employment, extending as it does to many hundreds of thousands of workmen and to their whole lives, is by far the worst in its evil effects." And again, "It is this system of Under-Employment which is, above all causes, responsible for the perpetual manufacture of paupers that is going on." It is because the better organization of the labour market may ultimately do something to lessen the number of men among whom this intermittent work is distributed, that the Commissioners place it in the fore-front of their programme of reform.

In adopting this view the President of the Board of Trade has support from other quarters. At a conference recently

SAINT GEORGE

held in London, representing 1,400,000 trade unionists, resolutions were passed in favour of the scheme ; the Central Unemployed body heartily approves, the delegates of the Labour Party who recently went to Germany, "Sir Charles Booth, and economists as diverse as Prof. Ashley and Prof. Chapman"—to quote Mr. Churchill's speech in the House—are in its favour, as well as several prominent members of the Opposition.

The argument with regard to the stagnant pools of labour and the amount of reserve which is really required in any industrial organization has been so forcibly urged in and out of season by Mr. Beveridge, and is so clearly expounded in the Minority Report of the Royal Commission, that it is not necessary to go over the ground again. Analogies abound in other departments of industry, wherever there is the slightest amount of organization. Every one would agree that it would be unnecessary and wasteful for all the joint stock banks in the kingdom to keep a bullion reserve in their tills sufficient for their maximum possible requirements. This purpose can be achieved by maintaining a claim on the central fund at the Bank of England, which is of course much smaller than the sum of the individual reserves required if each kept their own. It is equally wasteful in the same sort of way to keep an army of casual labourers distributed in little groups at each employer's gate. But bullion kept under such circumstances merely loses the interest which would accrue for its use ; it retains its full market value. This is unfortunately not the case with human currency ; the metal is perishable, and the gold rapidly deteriorates. Principal as well as interest is lost.

The argument from authority is supported by the argument from experience. Labour exchanges have been used with success abroad, and though the achievements of the exchanges established under the Unemployed Workmen's Act in this country have not been very conspicuous, they have slowly enlarged their sphere of usefulness. The connection with

THE GOVERNMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

the Distress Committees has been a great handicap, and has helped to keep away the skilled and efficient workers, except such as have lost their industrial status. No voluntary system of exchanges can be successful which has not the confidence of the organized workers of the country. It is a very hopeful sign that the Trade Unions are coming into closer touch with the existing exchanges, and are welcoming the proposed new organization.

The Bill which initiates this great departure in Labour policy is the most unpretentious document imaginable; but, like the grain of mustard seed, it promises to grow into a great tree. Let us hope it will not be the moulder who will lodge in the branches of it. The two pages of the Bill do nothing more than authorize the establishment of the exchanges. The details are left quite vague, and a very wide discretion is given to the Board of Trade. The main lines on which it is proposed to develop were, however, sketched by Mr. Churchill in his exposition, the details having been elaborated by a Departmental Committee of the Board. It is proposed to divide the whole country into ten divisions, each with a divisional clearing house presided over by a divisional chief, and all co-ordinated with the national Clearing House in London. Distributed among these ten divisions would be between thirty and forty first-class labour exchanges in towns of 100,000 and upwards, forty-five second-class exchanges in towns between 50,000 and 100,000, and about 150 minor sub-offices or third-class exchanges or waiting-rooms. The latter would be established in smaller centres. In the principal centres there will be an advisory committee consisting of equal numbers of representatives of workers and employers under an official chairman. The ordinary work of the exchanges is estimated to cost £170,000 a year. In the earlier years while building operations are in progress the sum will be increased to £200,000.

The feature of this proposal is that the Government is not

SAINT GEORGE

yet prepared to make the use of the exchanges compulsory. The first reason, which is a practical one, is all sufficient. It is that the Government is not ready to deal with the surplus of labour which would be displaced if all casual work had to be engaged through a labour exchange. But apart from this consideration, the Bill would become highly contentious if it were of a compulsory nature. Public opinion is not prepared to risk everything on an organization not yet tried in this country, nor are employers willing to give up the right of choosing their men. This latter difficulty is imaginary rather than real, for though masters would surrender the power of picking up men at their own gates, they would really enlarge the field of choice. They would be compelled to go to a particular labour store, it is true, but they would find there all the goods displayed. The larger the market the wider the field of choice. But so long as the scheme remains optional, there is no possibility of dealing with the "stagnant pools of labour" in a systematic manner, and were the decasualization of labour the only aim of labour exchanges it would certainly be arguable whether the expenditure of the sum of £200,000 a year would be justified, especially as the exchanges are to be deprived of the one weapon which would make them really effective. But the organization will gain experience and will be ready when public opinion is advanced to the stage of demanding compulsion. The immediate benefit of the exchanges will, however, be seen in the other activities which will grow up round them. It is hoped, and it is reasonable to suppose, that the local labour exchange will become the centre of labour organization in the district, and that it will be used for meetings of Trade Boards and other allied purposes. But above all it may be used to assist efforts which are being made to check the degradation of boy labour. The work of Apprenticeship Committees will be greatly helped by the information which the exchange will accumulate.

THE GOVERNMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

But the better organization of labour by means of exchanges cannot touch the question of big cyclical fluctuations in trade. The latter are sometimes assumed to affect artisans and factory hands rather than the casual workers of the type who apply to Distress Committees. This opinion is perhaps encouraged by the stress laid by recent writers on the permanent nature of casual or under-employment. But it can easily be shown how greatly even casual employment varies with the condition of trade. The following figures give applications to the Committees in the last four years, and it will be seen that the numbers closely follow the state of employment in the organized trades as represented by the proportion of Trade Unionists in receipt of unemployed benefit. The figures are for London :—

Applicants to Distress Committee	1905-6	1906-7	1907-8	1908-9 to March 6th
... ...	39,728	28,181	32,624	48,532
Percentage of Trade Unionists unemployed	1905	1906	1907	1908
6·4	5·6	6·1	8·1	

In all these years the proportion of general labourers remained about the same, viz. 50 to 55 per cent.

There is thus a cyclical movement in the demand for unskilled as well as in that for skilled labour ; and it must be remembered that the effect of cyclical fluctuations is often to bring down into the ranks of casual employment many who are unable to tide over the year or years of depression. It is of the first importance to keep workers from losing their industrial status under such conditions. This is to be done not by moving them from place to place, or from job to job, but by some form of insurance.

Dove-tailing of occupations can be carried out when

SAINT GEORGE

seasonal periods are quite definite and well known, but the field for doing so is limited, and leaves a very great deal to the administrator's discretion. It must not be forgotten that the mobility of labour, on which so much stress is laid in arguments on behalf of labour exchanges, is not altogether a desirable end in itself. On the contrary, the continued movement from place to place and the periodical breaking up of the home, which is so often involved, is a great social evil. It is a serious hindrance to the development of citizenship if a man cannot remain long enough in a town to enable him to take root, and to share in the common life of the community. The mobility of labour is a necessity for the national well-being ; but it should be secured as much as possible by the drafting of the rising generations into the channels where labour is most required, rather than by moving adult workers from place to place.

To institute a scheme of national insurance against unemployment is no small matter. The recent report of the Management Committee of the General Federation of Trade Unions states that in fifteen years ending 1906, 100 principal unions paid £2,537,293 in unemployed benefits. There is an average of 480,000 people to be provided for. A payment of 5s. a week to these would mean £6,240,000 plus the cost of administration. Threepence a week for each of the 12,000,000 persons liable to unemployment would raise £7,800,000 annually. Such a sum the Committee consider should be raised equally from employees, employers, and the State. This is on the whole a very low figure. It gives an unemployment percentage of only 4 per cent. The Board of Trade shows an average for the ten years ending 1907 of 4·2, and in the last five years of 5·5. It assumes also that the Board of Trade figures are applicable to the whole labour market. But it is evident that commercial and Government occupations on the one hand, and risky and variable

THE GOVERNMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

occupations on the other, should be classed together. This is a difficult question which has arisen in all insurance schemes which have included a different degree of risk. Should those persons who are lucky enough to be in a stable occupation help to bear the risks of those whose work is subject to great variations? If it were true that wages really took into account the uncertainty of employment, it would clearly be fair to charge particular workers with the whole of the insurance premiums required. But it would be hard to prove that this is the case, for though it is evident that wages are high in some variable trades on account of the risk, it is not clear that they are higher by the amount of the premiums required to insure against the fluctuation. Practical considerations have, however, again decided the question in favour of insurance by trades. Granted that it is not yet possible to insure the whole working classes, it would only be possible to insure *some men in all trades* under a voluntary system, which would almost certainly fail to include the unskilled men.

The Government therefore proposes to institute compulsory Unemployment Insurance in the building, shipbuilding, and engineering industries, or, as stated by the President of the Board of Trade, in housebuilding and works of construction, engineering, machine- and tool-making, ship and boat-building, vehicles, sawyers and general labourers working at those trades. At the last census these trades comprised 2,500,000 adult males, or roughly one-third of the total population engaged in purely industrial work. Of the remainder, nearly one-half were employed in textiles, mines, and railways, which do not present so great fluctuations, or at least meet them by restricting working hours, etc. It is proposed to pay benefits on a scale somewhat lower than those paid by the best Trade Unions for a period greater than the average length of time out of work. In order to enable such benefits to be paid, it will be necessary to raise something

SAINT GEORGE

between 6d. and 5d.—rather nearer 6d. than 5d.—per man per week, and that sum is to be raised by the employers, by the workmen, and by the State.

Looking at these groups of trades, it is evident that the Government has taken in hand the most difficult cases of all, not only so far as the higher artisans are concerned, but also as regards the unskilled in these trades. The Distress Committee returns for the last three years show that the applicants were distributed among various occupations in the following proportions :—

	Per cent.
General or casual labour	52·2
Building trades	20·1
Engineering, shipbuilding, and metal trades	7·5
Boot and shoemaking	2·1
Domestic service	1·9
Furnishing and wood-working trades	1·7
Food, drink, and tobacco trades	1·4
Textile trades	·8
Tailoring and clothing	·6
Printing and paper trades	·5
Other occupations	11·2
	100·

The feature of this table is the preponderance of the building trade. If we succeed in insuring the whole of the men occupied in building an enormous step will have been taken, for in all the small provincial towns of the country this trade is the only serious winter problem, which would be reduced to manageable proportions if this difficulty were out of the way.

The insurance proposals of the Government may safely be expected to commend themselves to the public even more than labour exchanges, while the element of compulsion is likely to produce a more immediate effect. It is within the bounds of practical politics to make insurance compulsory, whereas if the

THE GOVERNMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

use of the former was made obligatory, much opposition would certainly be met with. Further, the working man is not anxious to see one man get two jobs, while another gets none at all. In most occupations the sentiment is quite naturally in favour of sharing the work round as far as it will go. This immediate effect of an efficient system of labour exchanges would be an unpopular one among the men themselves, while the ultimate benefit would only be seen in the long run. Insurance suffers from no such disadvantage.

But while the aim of insurance is so desirable, the means are correspondingly difficult. Experience of insurance in other directions shows how easy it is to evade and make false claims. Unexpected effects are constantly showing themselves, and it often takes years to arrive at a satisfactory working basis. An example of the abuse of insurance is furnished by the Compensation Act of 1907, which states that "Compensation is payable *from the day of the accident*, if the illness lasts more than a fortnight." The result has been an enormous increase of illnesses lasting over a fortnight. A Mutual Benefit Society in South Wales reports the following remarkable change, which is obviously a result of the Act :—

	First half, 1907, per 1000 workmen.	Second half, 1907, per 1000 workmen.
Illnesses of more than 7 and less than 14 days.	11.89	7.44
Illnesses of more than 14 days	35.08	69.26

The difficulty of preventing this kind of abuse will be particularly great in the case of Unemployed Benefit. Unemployment is not a simple matter, and it will be hard to prove a genuine desire for work. But the association with the Labour Exchange will make it possible to offer work as a test of willingness, if work is to be had. The difficulty will, however, at once arise

SAINT GEORGE

as to terms. Will the Exchange help to maintain the standard rate, or will it press men to accept a lower figure? What will it do in the case of old or slow workers, and what will be its attitude in the event of a strike? These questions, though not so vital where the exchanges are on a voluntary basis, will become acute as soon as the offer of work by the Exchange is made the test in connection with unemployed benefit. On all these points the Trade Unions will have something to say. The further difficulty of overlapping with existing Trade Unions ought not to be insuperable, especially if the Government is ready to meet the Unions by allowing them to compound for their members.

Experience on the Continent in the matter of Unemployed Insurance furnishes very little guide. Most experiments have hitherto been local, and practically all are voluntary. The Norwegian law is hardly yet in working order, and the Danish law has only just been passed, though the latter, according to Mr. Schloss, has a good chance of success, on account of the small proportion of unskilled workers in Denmark. We have, in fact, absolutely no experience as to the possibility of working a scheme on the scale proposed for this country. There is, however, no doubt that if it can be worked, insurance is the right way to tackle the problem, so long as we have fluctuations in industry—and no one has yet shown how the latter are to be avoided. It would be worth a great sacrifice to make the scheme a success, for though it is impossible to say how many of the casual and unemployable class would have been saved from their present situation if placed into proper trained occupations in boyhood, and kept from falling into unskilled ranks by insurance, the numbers must be very large. Even if labour exchanges do little to solve the present casual labour problem, they will be thoroughly justified if they can materially assist the organization of boy labour and can provide the means of working this scheme of Unemployed Insurance.

REVIEWS

MEDIÆVAL AND CLASSICAL LITERATURE

A History of Architectural Development. By Professor F. M. Simpson. Vol. II. Mediæval. 21s. net.

Handbook of Greek Architecture. By Prof. Allan Marquand. Macmillan. 10s. net.

I

IT is now more than half a century since Fergusson's *Handbook* appeared, and our wonder at its achievement increases as each new work is published. With comparatively little literary material and none of our modern facilities for travel, what a monument Fergusson raised! Despite all its inevitable faults it has not yet been superseded. From time to time some American professor, whose trumpeter is recently deceased, announces that he is the first to discover some new principle. But we can find it all in Fergusson, whom the professor wisely does not mention.

Professor Simpson, in his second volume of *A History of Architectural Development* (Longmans), has produced a most valuable piece of work. Whether it can definitely supersede Fergusson is doubtful, as the scale is too small. Assuming an average for the volume yet to come, there will be fewer pages than in the original two volumes of Fergusson, whilst on account of the larger type there is less matter on a page. Fergusson is now published in five volumes. This is an unnecessary handicap at the outset.

Nevertheless, if Professor Simpson has not given us all for which we hoped, we may still say that, as far as it goes, we have here the best book of its kind in existence.

In so vast a field great elaboration of detail is impossible, and on the whole it is remarkable how much has been included within the small compass. This has been greatly helped by a considerable number of sectional and constructional drawings,

SAINT GEORGE

which tend to be lacking in the general histories. Naturally many plans are given, but in these days of cheap line blocks the number might have been trebled.

There is here no flourish of trumpets and the author makes no pretence of offering any great new contribution to the subject, yet in each volume we have something of special value. In the first volume the admirably succinct account of the Byzantine style, short as it necessarily is, is yet the best general survey in our language. In the present volume the treatment of the French work, and especially that of the South of France, is admirable, and this hitherto has been very inadequately dealt with by English writers.

The result has been to crowd out other things, and here the smallness of scale of the whole work makes itself felt. Ireland is entirely omitted. Justice is hardly done to Scotland, which is dismissed in half a dozen paragraphs. Even the North of England does not get its due. Professor Simpson puts the group of great churches between Malvern and Wells, sixty-eight miles the longest way, as without a rival; why he does not add Worcester, which only makes the distance seventy-four, does not appear.

But Durham and York are only sixty-two miles apart, with Ripon, Fountains, Rievaulx in between, not to mention Darlington, Easby, Malton, Byland (once the largest Cistercian church in the world), Mount Grace (a unique specimen of a Carthusian monastery), and perhaps the finest group of Saxon churches in Britain. Lincoln and York are only fifty-seven miles apart.

But the finest group for Gothic study in Britain is probably that whose longest measurement is between Patrington and Mount Grace or Ripon, a distance of sixty-nine miles, containing York Minster, Beverley Minster, Ripon Cathedral, Selby Abbey, Fountains Abbey, Rievaulx Abbey, Howden, Hedon, Bolton Abbey, Beverley St. Mary's, Kirkstall, Patrington, Mount Grace Priory, St. Mary's Abbey York, Byland,

REVIEWS

Malton Priory, Bridlington Priory, and Wakefield Cathedral, besides numbers of very fine first-class minor specimens.

On page 64 again we read that few windows in England combine both flowing and vertical lines (presumably excepting the mullions). But they are common enough in the North, and if all curves of double curvature are to be reckoned as flowing, the examples with ogee arches must be more than merely common.

Then the date, 1373, given for the first appearance of flamboyant work, is far too late, and shows a want of knowledge of Northern English work. Patrington, Selby, Beverley St. Mary's—all in work from thirty to sixty years earlier—show flamboyant character, the last-named in tracery, moldings,¹ and interpenetrations of a pronounced type. It is interesting to notice that the English priority in this respect is acknowledged by French archaeologists.

A similar want of acquaintance with Northern examples is shown in the chronological error with regard to the introduction of the ridge rib, where it is stated, on page 228, that the English vaults, where it appears, are fifty years later than S. Radagonde, Poitiers, and S. Pierre Saumur. Even accepting the date given for these, namely 1170, we may still safely attribute the north transept aisle vaults of Ripon to an earlier date, probably 1165 and possibly earlier still.

Malmesbury is given as the first structural use of the pointed arch, and is dated 1140 (probably, by the way, a wrong date, but the Malmesbury dates are a thorny question). Durham nave is considerably earlier. But there are Southern examples too, as at Rochester, also in such transept crossings as St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield. Gloucester shows a pointed structural arch between 1090 and 1100.

But, after all, in a general survey these are minor points, and the book is calculated to give a very just idea of the

¹ It is a pity that Professor Simpson has not fallen into line with other modern writers, as it is now many years since Paley pointed out the correct spelling of this mediæval word.

SAINT GEORGE

position of English mediæval work. Professor Simpson's outlook is broad and sane. Bred upon Gothic soil, he is saved from the puerilities of those from other parts of the world, who fix upon some one building that happens to take their fancy, and proclaim its individual principles and peculiarities to be the sole essentials of what was really the movement of half a continent. On the other hand, there is no narrow patriotism, and the special attention called to the South of France is of great value.

This raises two interesting questions. It is one thing to point out the special excellences of any particular branch of Gothic. It is quite another thing to say that these excellences are peculiarly Gothic.

This Southern French style, indeed, is markedly classical in its conceptions, and its very excellence is largely that of a "cross." Indeed, Professor Simpson's book tends to bring out the classical affinities of all French work and to show, that the more North we go the more Gothic we may be. His passing remarks upon the West fronts are distinctly suggestive.

On the other hand—and this again rises more or less directly from what is said in the book—we must be very careful to distinguish achievement from conception and intention, particularly with regard to inspiration for ourselves to-day. We must ask, Which conception offers the finest possibilities? not, Which conception was actually carried out in the boldest manner?

This in its turn leads to something even more fundamental, namely, what is to be considered the determining factor in any judgment upon architecture? Surely architecture as architecture and distinct from building is æsthetic rather than utilitarian, and must be judged accordingly.

Whatever may be the place of æsthetic philosophy in architectural training, some grip of fundamentals is essential. Here and there throughout this excellent piece of work there is something alarmingly like an airy indifference. That the laws of the beautiful and ugly are as absolute as the laws of right

REVIEWS

and wrong is presumably a truism, not that we shall ever all agree as to what is beautiful any more than we all agree as to what is right, although probably historically there has been less dispute over judgments of beauty than judgments of conduct.

But the failure to recognize that there are principles, whether we fully reach them or not, would be the negation of all art, as the corresponding failure would be the negation of all morality.

Perhaps this appears as much as anywhere in the treatment of the vault, which in other respects also is much less satisfactory than it might be. Whatever contributory reasons may have led to the use of the pointed arch in the vault, æsthetic considerations must have been an important element, as the other reasons suggested are either not facts or can be equally well met in other ways.

First, it was not to keep the crowns level, as in French vaults the crowns were not made level even when the pointed arch was introduced. Further, the crowns can be kept level in other ways, which are, however, less æsthetically pleasing.

It was not to avoid the twisted diagonal, as most, if not all, writers assert, as a limited knowledge of mathematics will show that the pointed arch by itself does not avoid twisted diagonals. It avoids a certain abruptness of twist, which is æsthetically unpleasing it is true. It is certainly strong, but no stronger than an elliptical form, which would also have avoided the other difficulties. This was actually used in Renaissance vaults.

Neither can it be pleaded that the English architects, at any rate, did not know of the elliptical form. Quite the contrary, they used it with the pointed arch, and, moreover, they improved upon it—again for æsthetic reasons—in the highly ingenious pseudo-elliptical forms used in most of the best English vaulting. In short, the pointed arch æsthetically preserves the organic unity better than any other form, particularly when pseudo-elliptical curves are used. This was the probable origin of the later three- and four-centred arches. Winchester nave arches, by the way, are three-centred, the haunches being

SAINT GEORGE

struck from the same centre, but are wrongly described as four-centred in Professor Simpson's book.

The oblong bay for the vault, again, is used for æsthetic reasons, and is used to enhance the vista effect upon which Gothic work, particularly in England, so largely depends. It was not "forced upon" the builders. Quite the reverse, it was used in this country from the first where there were no vaults at all, and in chapter houses where there were no aisles to predetermine the shape.

So much is this the case that when, in some of the later vaults, e.g. the Divinity School, Oxford, the Cathedral, Oxford, the fan vault of Westminster, a square was almost forced upon the builders, the oblong is carefully preserved, especially in the Divinity School, by the great transverse arches which Professor Simpson terms a "fancy," whereas they are the soul of the whole æsthetic composition. The Divinity School has no aisles, and could perfectly well have been vaulted with square bays if squareness were desired.

The great timber roofs have oblong bays for the same reason. In speaking of these, Professor Simpson remarks that all the timber roofs of our churches are of oak, although some are said to be of chestnut, which he doubts. It is interesting, then, to note that the great roof of Westminster Hall, perhaps the finest and certainly one of the largest timber roofs ever erected, is of chestnut.

No book covering so much ground could ever hope to be free from error, and doubtless many small slips will disappear in subsequent editions—such, for instance, as the doubt cast upon the question as to whether mosaic was invented in Italy. Of course, it was not invented in Italy. It might be said that it was in common use in Greece before Rome itself was "invented," and by the time of the Attalids it had attained a very high degree of perfection.

The book as a whole, however, is a sound and useful piece of work, which will form a welcome addition to the shelves of the architect or archæologist.

REVIEWS

II

AFTER twelve years, if not more, one announcement at any rate being dated 1897, Professor Marquand's book upon Greek Architecture has at last appeared. The death of Mr. Anderson caused a similar delay in the case of his work on Greek and Roman Architecture, which has been most unfortunate for the study of the subject, as the announcement of these books has deterred others from entering the field. One turns eagerly to see the result of these years of labour, and certainly as far as quantity is concerned there will be no disappointment. As to quality a verdict is difficult. It would not be an unfair description of the book to say that it had no "quality" in the ordinary sense, either good or bad. The work is practically an index rather than a book. Evidence is not weighed nor are pros and cons set forth, but a simple assertion is put forward and a reference given to some other author. In this it may be contrasted with the work of Professor Simpson reviewed above, which owes its value and its charm to the real personal observation that marks it throughout. This may not be what was expected; it may be a disappointment to many, although to some it will not at all impair the value of the work.

Before examining the work, however, a word or two is demanded with regard to the cover. We were told that these handbooks were to be a "series" and "form a handy encyclopædia." What the publishers can be about to allow a "handy encyclopædia" to change its binding half way through is incomprehensible. But further, the original binding was particularly effective. In fact, so much above the average was it that volumes have been bought for their appearance by people who had no intention of opening them. So long as the change merely affected reprints it was of no consequence, as copies in good condition of the fine old blue cover can always be obtained second hand, thus saving the publishers the trouble of sending out their new red copies,

SAINT GEORGE

and students of art and archæology are naturally particular about an artistic cover. In justice to the original edition, it should be noticed that the somewhat florid design, which looks so vulgar in gold upon red, was by no means offensive when impressed "blind" upon the blue; in fact, rather the reverse.

The result of the index character of the book is to convey very erroneous impressions to the student: statements of that not very reliable author Vitruvius are set down as facts, and utterly unsupported theories of Mr. Goodyear are in no way distinguished from the careful work of Professor Dörpfeld. It also has a tendency to make one mistrust the author's own judgment, which is hardly counteracted by consideration of that judgment, when the data are given by which it can be weighed. Take, for instance, the following, on p. 249:—

"When the stylobate of a temple was curved, and the front and lateral stylobate followed the arcs of the same circle, the pavement would correspond in level to the surface of a great dome; but when the front and lateral curvatures were in different arcs, as—for example, in the Parthenon—the level of the pavement would correspond to the extrados of a huge cross-vault with surfaces sinking at the angles so as to form a channel. It is safe to say that Greek temple pavements never exhibited this peculiarity," etc. etc.

The number of elementary mathematical blunders crowded into these few words is astonishing. In the first place, supposing the top were domical, the arcs would not be arcs of "great circles" at all, but of "small circles," and therefore, as the floor is not square but oblong, would be arcs of different circles. The very condition of preserving the dome over the rectangle is that they should not be the same. Secondly, cylindrical intersections could take place, whether the arcs were of equal circles or not, or indeed spherical intersections as far as that is concerned. Thirdly, there would not be the slightest difficulty in obtaining a spheroidal surface whatever the nature of the arcs, and so on, and so on. All this is in addition to

REVIEWS

the fact that to call any of these curves arcs of circles is an unsupported assumption, unless the author gives the measurements upon which the statement is based. Even more surprising mathematically is the suggestion on page 46 that a horizontal line of cleavage will affect a vertical pressure, as though a force could have an effect in a direction at right angles to its own. Again, whatever Greek practice may have been with regard to the ridge piece, there is no justification for putting forward a mere assumption without evidence merely to build another theory upon it. There is no difficulty in building a roof without a ridge piece at all ; numbers of medieval roofs have neither ridge piece nor tie beams, although most of them have an equivalent for the latter.

But putting mathematical questions aside, although the study of architecture without mathematics would seem to be impossible, what is to be made of this, on page 313 : "The amount of light which entered through the door was deemed sufficient for the purposes of the Greek cult. It is accordingly unnecessary to imagine," etc. etc.? Who deemed? This is a casual way of dismissing the difficult lighting problem of Greek temples. Professor Marquand may deem it a sufficient amount of light that could pass through five ranges of columns and two doors, the total distance being 115 feet and the image nearly another 100 feet beyond that. What about those people who do not deem this sufficient? The whole point is a *petitio principii*; the very thing we want to know is whether the Greeks did or did not deem it sufficient. The Parthenon frieze still *in situ* is hard enough to see, and that is outside.

In dealing with the question of origins, the same weakness is traceable. It proves absolutely nothing to show that a construction *could* be carried out in wood; a lintel construction, for instance, is as natural to one material as the other, and would have been used in each case whether the other material existed or not. In different parts of the book a stone and a wooden origin for the triglyph is suggested, which must simply

SAINT GEORGE

be two items in the "index," although the authorities are not quoted; because there is no attempt made to reconcile them or weigh the one against the other. The problem itself is too large to discuss here, and the probability is that in the main Professor Marquand is not far from the truth, although he does not explain how he arrives there. On the whole he lays too much emphasis upon the wooden theory. For instance, the more or less circular discs that form the early akroteria could not possibly mask the wooden ridge piece and wall plates. A circular wall plate is unthinkable, and the ridge piece would be too low. The central one might possibly have terminated the circular capping tiles of the ridge, and the others were in harmony with that and the antifixes of the circular cover tiles. But the main reason was doubtless æsthetic, and ornaments of some kind are found in these positions in all styles. As to the triglyphs, the great insistence upon the corner triglyphs by Greek architects and the almost inconceivable trouble that their adjustment caused is an argument based upon what actually took place, and has at least as much weight as any armchair theory, of what might have taken place, by persons in practice unacquainted with building. A stone origin demands a triglyph at the corner, a wooden origin demands a metope, which in spite of its infinitely easier management does not occur, except once, until Roman times. In short there is a want of practical first-hand grip of the subject that shows itself particularly on the mathematical and constructive side. For instance, in such little points as the function of the sima, the whole significance is missed from a want of touch with roof-drainage questions, not only in classical architecture but also in medieval or modern, or any other architecture whatever.

By far the most valuable part of the book is the methodical way in which the inter-relations of the various adjustments are set out. This has not hitherto been done, and should be of great assistance to the student who desires to reach the æsthetic quality of Greek architecture and Greek art. Professor Mar-

REVIEWS

quand's own point of view is entirely non-aesthetic, and he wavers between a utilitarianism and an imitative naturalism, after the usual manner of the ordinary non-artistic modern. This is in spite of the fact that he himself notes that naturalistic ornament belongs to the period of decadence. It is this adjustment and readjustment that made Greek architecture a living style, which Vitruvius would have killed had it been truly alive in his day, and which the British Palladian so effectually murdered immediately upon its resurrection.

And so, my Lord, your just, your noble rules
Fill half the land with imitating fools,
Conscious they act a true Palladian part,
And if they starve they starve by rules of art.

Who . . .
Call the loud winds through long arcades to roar,
Proud to catch cold at a Venetian door.

That the study of Greek architecture is probably the best key to Greek æsthetic does not seem to be sufficiently realized by any writer. With the ordinary observer it is impossible to discuss the feeling of a line in the human figure or a piece of drapery. The swing or rhythm of a pose is unintelligible to him. He can see whether the weight is upon the advanced foot or not; he can see whether drapery clings or flies loose, whether it be naturalistically treated or conventionalized, stiff or flowing, and so on, but not very much more. What he cannot see it is not much use to discuss. But the spacing of the mutules or the jointing of the stereobate is mathematically demonstrable, and each by a chain of reasoning can mathematically be shown to be interdependent. To explain the æsthetic necessity for this inter-relation may be a difficult matter, but at least we can make sure that the inter-relation is seen, however inartistic the observer, which we cannot at all ensure in the case of a lock of hair and the folds of a

SAINT GEORGE

chlamys. Or, again, the possible range of variation can easily be discussed in the former case, but not in the latter. But not only does architecture offer abundant scope within the single work of art, it also offers opportunities of mathematical assessment in the development of æsthetic endeavour. An examination of the quality of curve used at different times in the echinus or the entasis of the column throws a flood of light upon the æsthetic quality of the sculpture of the same periods.

In any case, in spite of certain obvious limitations, the book is one with which the architectural student cannot dispense, and for which he has every reason to be grateful to the author.

A few small points may require attention in a later edition. The capital from Phigaleia, Fig. 257, does not remotely resemble Cockerell's drawing, and an explanation is necessary. In Figs. 180 and 181 the shading is all wrong. Of course, if a key be given, which is not the case here, any system may be adopted. But there seems no advantage in setting aside a system universally accepted throughout Europe since 1630, and familiar to every child on all but the recent coinage of this country. Perhaps it has not yet reached America. The tendency to spell Greek words correctly is as far as it is carried to be commended. The recent action of the Board of Education here will probably hasten the change. But why rise at least to "tympanon" in some places and fall to "tympanum" in others? We should have expected the correct spelling of the medieval word molding, to which attention is called in the review above, to have appealed to Professor Marquand. A grammatical error occurs on page 109, and it is quite clear that the author does not understand the nature of cloisonné enamel and the cloisons that are its distinguishing characteristic. A small historic point with regard to the akanthos is that its climax, in the sense in which Professor Marquand uses the term, was surely reached in Byzantine work, not in true Greek work at all.

J. B. STOUGHTON HOLBORN.